

A
172
W2

CHURCH AND STATE: THE PROBLEM OF ALLEGIANCE
"

A Dissertation
presented to
the Faculty of the
School of Theology at Claremont

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Religion

by
William F. Waller
June 1972

PERMISSION TO COPY
MUST BE OBTAINED
FROM AUTHOR.

This dissertation, written by

William F. Waller

*under the direction of his Faculty Committee,
and approved by its members, has been presented
to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of
Theology at Claremont in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of*

DOCTOR OF RELIGION

Faculty Committee

Presiding
Harold Rhodes

Date June 2, 1972

F. Thomas Leather

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
THE THESIS.....	iv
I. THE NATURE OF ALLEGIANCE.....	1
A. ACTS OF ALLEGIANCE.....	1
B. THE IMPACT OF ALLEGIANCE.....	9
C. AMBIGUITY IN ALLEGIANCE.....	16
D. SOME OBSERVATIONS.....	24
II. ANALYSES OF SOME TEXTS CONCERNING ALLEGIANCE IN CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS IN ISRAEL.....	26
A. GIDEON.....	26
B. SAUL.....	35
C. DAVID AND SOLOMON.....	49
D. THE DIVIDED KINGDOM.....	61
E. AMOS.....	73
F. JEREMIAH.....	77
G. MODELS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.....	82
III. CONCLUSIONS CONCERNING A THEOLOGY OF ALLEGIANCE IN CHURCH- STATE RELATIONS.....	87
A. ALLEGIANCE IN CONTEXT.....	88
B. THE OLD TESTAMENT MODELS INTERPRETED.....	92
C. CLOSING REMARKS.....	106
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	108

THE THESIS

Allegiance is a relationship of religious contours which is singular in nature. It is a supreme relationship which claims obedience from the devotee. Allegiance is reinforced by acts of allegiance. It will not tolerate other ultimate relationships in its constituents. Conflict arises when man shares affiliation with two institutions, which claim his allegiance. He will tolerate no other. For the Christian, all other relationships are secondary and must be related in deference to the Church which is the constitutional expression of Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF ALLEGIANCE

The nature of allegiance is a crucial block in the framework of Church-State relations. It is unfortunate that in our time allegiance and loyalty become confused. Within this paper, allegiance will refer to an acknowledgment of a superior-inferior relationship. Loyalty will refer to a peer relationship. Although the meanings of the two words have become blurred, some separation of the terms is necessary if the seriousness of Church or State demands on individuals is to be understood.

The scope of this paper is threefold. One, it will examine the nature of allegiance, paying particular attention to acts of allegiance, the impact of commitment, and ambiguity in allegiance. Two, it will examine some pertinent Old Testament texts to discern the nature of allegiance in Church-State relations in Israel. Finally, the two areas of study will be compared and contrasted in order that some conclusions concerning a theology of allegiance in Church-State relations might be drawn.

A. ACTS OF ALLEGIANCE

There are a number of steps in the development of allegiance. Acts of allegiance are a crucial element in the ongoing process of sustaining allegiance. However, acts of allegiance are preceded by and precipitated from the philosophical or theological justification

of allegiance. R. S. Barbour is helpful at this point.

The first (fact) is that no group or nation, however small or insignificant, can exist for long simply on a basis of geographical contiguity; there must be some idea, some cause, some conception of the good life however rudimentary, to hold it together. Thus from the very beginnings of social life there is implicit a distinction between attachment to the group itself and attachment or loyalty to the 'idea' (for want of a better word) which it represents.¹

Whether or not the distinction which is drawn is acceptable, the premise which suggests that communal groups cannot be sustained without a common idea or cause is crucial. "Group" can easily refer to a religious constituency as well as a political party or social clan. Instead of the "good life," one might substitute the "meaningful life" since many groups and nations are confronted with conflict. Hence, the cause is the development of and the sustainer of meaning. An idea is difficult to grasp and continually needs to be interpreted to the followers of the group.

Again, Barbour is useful:

The third fact of importance is that men need, and make generous use of, symbols to express their attachments and loyalties. This is especially true when the distinction between the group itself and the cause or idea which holds it together is clearly marked. The less reflective member of the group in particular need some symbol or set of symbols to represent for them what the more philosophically inclined are able to grasp in an abstract form. Occasionally, as with the slogan of the French Revolution - Liberté, égalité, fraternité - a formula denoting abstract ideas itself becomes a kind of concrete symbol; but the symbols of French nationality are perhaps rather the tricolor and the Mar-seillaise, the evocative 'La France,' and human figures like that

¹R. S. Barbour, "Loyalty and Law in New Testament Times," Scottish Journal of Theology XI, (1958), 340.

of Joan of Arc . . . ²

This statement is laden with important points which are worthy of note. The first point bearing attention is the assumption that symbols are the necessary means of expression of loyalty (or allegiance). It seems safe to say that man is a symbolic thinker. The difficult relationships that confront him in living are made understandable or workable through the use of symbols.³ If, indeed, man is reduced to symbolic representation, then one may assume that men create and recognize the symbolic forms used to explain or depict relationships. Ultimately, this is true. However, it seems evident that many symbols are acceded to as men grow into them. The symbols of the Church, for instance, the cross, are not conscious creations of the present Church, but rather the historical symbols of the Church which need to be again endowed with meaning. Men give the cross some of its meaning. Yet, much of its impact is and remains the historical baggage which the symbol itself carries and represents. Thus, the symbol of the cross is accepted in its historical context with some variations related to personal or cultural adjustment. Of course, there are new symbols created and used daily. One need only look to the advertising medium to see that. However, in the specific context of Barbour's statement, symbols of "attachments and loyalties," few new symbols are being created. The symbols, then, are significant because of their history. Further,

²Ibid.

³For a significant and useful discussion of symbols, see S. Langer, Philosophy in a New Key (New York: Mentor Books. 1942), especially chapters 2-6.

their history increases their significance. An historical symbol has a general context of common experience from which to speak. And speaking over the span of time reinforces the image of the common experience.

A second point which seems significant is the difference between the laity (the "less reflective members of the group") and the professionals (the "more philosophically inclined"). The vast majority of people do not participate in the decision-making process. That is to say, they are not directly involved in philosophical decision-making. Hence the role of the laity has been acceptance and confirmation of programs and symbols. This is significant in that the great majority participates in the use of symbols, not in the creating of them. If persons of authority and power invoke the symbols representative of the idea or cause, then the people reject or accept its use.

A third point that is significant is the recitation of symbols in a specific case, French nationality. Above, I have mentioned the character and genesis of symbols in general. Here, the specific use of symbols causes a change from philosophical definition to practical empowerment. The cross as an historic symbol has meaning and value because of its impact in history. Its present meaning is not only grounded in its history but in its use. Symbolic acts, rituals which reinforce the meaning of symbols, are that which create "attachments and loyalties." It is at this point of symbolic acts that the relationship of Church and State often comes into conflict.

Symbolic acts of the highest priority are acts of allegiance.

Acts of allegiance tend to differ in kind from other acts. One of the most common acts of allegiance is the pledge of allegiance. Here, two symbolic acts are incorporated in one activity. The placing of the right hand over the heart as a symbol of obedience and dedication has a long history. Furthermore, the recitation of the pledge, a verbal symbolic act, is not dissimilar to the common recitation of a creed. It is interesting to see that these two types of acts are not performed in any other context save the ritual of the Church. Again, these acts are explicitly clear. They are the acknowledgment, both physical and verbal, of the right of one thing or someone to command obedience and dedication. This is not an act denoting purpose. Neither is it an act of self-definition. Rather, it is an act of definition by which another creates the framework of my being. It is no accident that it is called a pledge of allegiance.

There seem to be only two contexts in which acts of allegiance occur, the State and the Church (as representative of God's manifest will). (There are societies and institutions which have conflict in allegiance other than the Church and State. We need only look to the Mafia or the Communist party to see that there are other possibilities. Nevertheless, we will restrict ourselves to Church and State). There are many settings which engender acts of loyalty. One gives loyalty to his friends, his family, his company, his team, his school, and so on. He does not give them his allegiance. Hence acts of allegiance may be either physical activities and/or verbal activities which symbolically represent dedication to and obedience to the prime idea

or power which sustains the group. It is expected, then, that these acts will be one of deference which are quantitatively different from all other activities.

Some acts which, in given situations, are used as acts of allegiance are: The pledge of allegiance, saluting the flag, singing the national anthem, genuflecting, recitation of the baptismal credo, and the like. Acts of allegiance are supported and reinforced by lesser acts which create a systematic framework wherein the constituent is reminded of the center.

It was in France in the 1790's that nationalism was made a religion and was thus introduced to the European continent. French patriots to make love for la patrie supreme through a compulsory national language, a compulsory national schooling, national holidays, special honors to meritorious citizens, and national rituals embodying the use of a national flag and the designation of the Marseillaise as the national anthem. Throughout France the new nationalism was symbolized by the words, placed on an altar in each French community, "The citizen is born, lives, and dies for the fatherland."⁴

The tendency to escalate loyalties into allegiance is more clearly seen in the rise of nationalism than in the history of the Church. The Church began with a different pre-understanding than did the State. Allegiance, for the Church, is no escalation but a prime article of constitution.

Acts of allegiance need not be wholly conscious. Indeed, acts of allegiance tend to be unanalyzed events. In fact, the cause for

⁴J. E. Wood, Jr., "The Problem of Nationalism in Church-State Relationships," Journal of Church and State, X (1968), 256.

allegiance may be quite hazy.⁵ The Pledge of Allegiance, for instance, does not give definitive help in establishing its locus of allegiance. Pledging to non-verbal symbols, the flag and the republic, brings about a state of indiscriminate allegiance. The flag and the nation cannot be circumscribed by definition or purpose easily. Slogans such as the French "Liberté, égalité, fraternité," and anthems with political or historical references, while still guilty of too little constitutional definition, are more specific than the flag or the republic. Yet, attachment to these uncircumscribed symbols can be far more significant than other symbols. Perhaps the reason for this is the greater possibility to load meaning upon the symbols by the one affirming them.

Nevertheless, these symbols draw unto themselves a devotion which becomes truly religious. Historically, the nation-state has nurtured this devotion with acts of allegiance, salutes, pledges, the singing of anthems, the exaltation of the flag, unequal immunity in the law for leaders.

Not content with the mere claim of national superiority, or even devotion to one's country, European nationalism during the nineteenth century expressed itself increasingly in terms of contempt for and even hostility toward people outside one's own nation.⁶

Allegiance is a singular activity. Thus, acts of allegiance tend to escalate attitudes toward an exclusivism. One can have many loyalties, but allegiance demands no suitors. It is no surprise then, that in

⁵Barbour, op.cit.

⁶Wood, op. cit., p. 257.

the twentieth century we have seen "the emergence of powerful nation-states which have demanded a supreme allegiance of their citizens."⁷

Here, the use of allegiance is still confused with loyalty. Allegiance is supreme. It is only in the relaxed parlance of everyday usage that allegiance becomes a possibility.

The acts of allegiance which move towards exclusivism are not restricted to Europe. J. E. Wood quotes Reinhold Niebuhr most effectively.

A few years ago, Reinhold Niebuhr trenchantly remarked, 'if one must judge by various commencement utterances . . . Americans have only one religion: devotion to democracy. They extol its virtues, are apprehensive about the perils to which it is exposed, pour maledictions upon its foes, rededicate themselves periodically to its purposes, and claim unconditional validity for its ideals!'"⁸

The key phrases in this quote are "one religion," "rededicate themselves periodically," and "unconditional validity." The acts of rededication are acts of allegiance. These acts affirm the ultimate validity of the "idea" as Barbour puts it. The validity of the idea lays its claim upon men and calls for their undivided devotion. This is religion. Acts of allegiance are events of religious devotion, rites which symbolically reinforce the supremacy of the "idea" over the people. In order to separate these acts from common expression, symbols and rituals with limited contexts are used. Hence the immediate recognition of genuflection, making the sign of the cross,

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid., p. 259. Quoted from Time (August 1, 1955).

elevating the flag, and pledging allegiance. These are the most common symbolic acts of allegiance.

B. THE IMPACT OF ALLEGIANCE

Recognizing that these are acts of allegiance which, in symbolic form, reinforce the "idea" in the minds of constituents, what can be said about the impact of allegiance. Essential to allegiance is a basic belief in a central idea. A group develops homogeneity in acceptance of a common experience or purpose which becomes a statement of constitution. This idea is the precondition of cohesiveness.

It was, perhaps, the Greeks of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. who first succeeded in demonstrating to the world with clarity that loyalty to a group involves a prior loyalty to an idea or purpose animating that group; and the first genuinely political statement of this truth that is to say, the first statement that aims at universality and attempts to ignore the merely particular or accidental - is found, not in Plato's Republic but in Aristotle's Politics.⁹

Barbour is surely correct when he says "an idea or purpose." To this, however, must be added experience. For instance, the American revolution is as powerful a symbol as the concepts of liberty or democracy. In fact, the American revolution carries with it a greater historical baggage than do the philosophical ideas. Certainly, the Church is directly involved here, for it was and is the experience of Jesus Christ that remains for her the central event or idea. The philosophical or theological terminology which has resulted bear some

⁹Barbour, op. cit., p. 341.

ability to focus and "animate." Even so, it is the person Jesus Who is crucial.

The centrality of the purpose, idea, or experience makes a common history a possibility. Diffuse activities tend to disassociate persons. A knowledge of one experience gives common credence and general acceptability of language. This is also to say that the central idea must be universal, i.e., it must be applicable to all manner of life styles and experiences. It would appear that the central idea is necessary for survival. Can the Church survive without religious devotion? Can the nation-state survive without nationalism? These questions can hardly be studied here. But, the historical fact of the continuity of the central idea or experience in institutions cannot be denied.

Wood draws a simple equation for the continuity of groups.

Nationalities were late in forming into states. For many centuries, it should be remembered, the social unit was not a nation-state, but the tribe, the city-state, the religious group, the feudal lord, the dynastic state, or the empire. Loyalty, therefore, was to the tribe, to the empire, to the king, to the church, and not to a nation-state as such.¹⁰

Loyalty is not the proper relationship in these examples. The attitude is allegiance, an ultimate and essential relationship. These are life and death, superior-inferior relations.

A second element of allegiance is the necessity of a belief in the central idea. It occurs to me that this seemingly obvious point is more problematic than at first glance. Belief is not necessarily

¹⁰Wood, op. cit., p. 251.

the outgrowth of intellectual assent to a concept. It may be. More likely, belief is reaction to, ingestion of, and experience of the idea or event. At this point men must rely on preaching, for preaching is exhortation from the standpoint of faith or belief. D. M. Kelley makes a couple of remarks which look in exactly the opposite direction. First, he says, "verbal assertions are relatively ineffective."¹¹ Verbal assertions have remained one of the most powerful persuasive tools available to men, particularly in the area of faith or belief. As support for this conclusion, he says:

Never have the language and symbolism of religion enjoyed such deference and popularity -- or the experience and exemplification of religious values and virtues in daily life been more neglected."¹²

One needs always to assess whether the symbols deferred to are being used with any historical continuity. Further, one needs to question the reality of the "deference" when no contiguous life-style is noted.

Wood sees the difference clearly when he remarks about the nature of nationalism.

There is less concern with authentic national history than with perpetuating a national mythology, in order to maintain the fires of patriotic fervor.¹³

Wood implies here that the central experience need not be grounded in fact in order to insure belief in the idea. It is not enough, then,

¹¹D. M. Kelley, "Beyond Separation of Church and State," Journal of Church and State, V. (1963), 196.

¹²Ibid., p. 183.

¹³Wood, op. cit., p. 260.

to have a central idea but also to engender a belief in that idea. The idea need not be historically accurate (although there are, generally, historical accuracies within the idea or myth.) Allegiance begins with this fundamental belief in the experience or idea. Belief, here, is to be understood as the acceptance of a claim which the idea places upon a person.

Acts of allegiance reinforce the experience which is the common cause of a group. Allegiance is a supreme authority relationship. That is, the experience which commands allegiance assimilates all aspects of life into its frame of reference and arranges those facets of life in a hierarchy of loyalties, attachments of penultimate importance. The assimilation of all aspects of life into the framework of the central idea has some interesting consequences. In the history of the United States, for instance, that our nationalism allows us to proliferate acts of devotion and reverence (religious acts) within the political context. This is allowed only insofar as the acts of devotion and reverence are directed to the State and not to the Church. These acts go largely unquestioned. On the other hand, acts of a political nature by the Church are immediately challenged. The State, one of the few entities that vie for our allegiance with any effectiveness, tries to assimilate all aspects of life within its purview. This is done on the grounds of the centrality of the national myth, the central experience which engenders and commands allegiance.

(It is interesting to note that the consistent question in Church-State relations is not the possibility of conflict in claims

of allegiance, but rather in the matter of enfranchisement. On a practical level, enfranchisement is a political question and not a political-theological question. The policy of disenfranchisement only limits the political and legal influence of one church body over another. It does not necessarily limit the scope of the Church's response to the world. Even an enfranchised Church can come into conflict in claims for allegiance. Hence, disenfranchisement only limits the legal leverage of one Church against another. It does not truly face the problem of claims for allegiance which both Church and State make.)

The final impact of allegiance is the overt or covert development of a hierarchy of loyalties within the scheme of the basic allegiance. Barbour provides a convenient jumping-off place. He claims

that the clash of loyalties, within a group or between groups, can at least be settled by the substitution of a wider loyalty which included or synthesizes the subordinate ones. At least in theory -- but there are limits to the process it seems, for a man needs roots in a community small enough to enable him to have status and significance as a part of it. Thus the philosophical effort to define, and the political effort to establish, a universal loyalty are tasks of supreme difficulty.¹⁴

The central idea or experience can be changed or modified by the people who confess it. Another possibility, though, is the changing or modifying of the group to satisfy the attitude of the central event. Examples of the former would be the modification of the nature of the state in France or Germany over the last seventy-five years. An example of the latter would be the slow modification of Christian

¹⁴Barbour, op. cit., p. 340.

converts to the example and experience of Jesus Christ, which has remained essentially the same for many centuries.

More probably, the common activity is the assimilation of ideas, concepts, and thrusts and the consequent evaluation of them in the light of allegiance held. Wood cites an example of this tendency.

Twentieth-century nationalism has all the earmarks of a religion. Nationalism today, wherever found, has its requirements of worship and ritual, its processions, its pilgrimages, its holy days, its temples, its shrines, its prophets of the past, its mythology, and its gospel of faith. Its essential doctrine, simply stated, is the exaltation of the state to supreme authority and the demand of a loyalty which supersedes all other loyalties. Opposition to the state is at best viewed with suspicion, and at its worst is regarded as the greatest moral and political crime one could commit.¹⁵

Wood, after cataloguing religious activities common to those experiences which demand allegiance, makes the key statement, "which supersedes all other loyalties." The tendency to subordinate what has been assimilated into its scope is a crucial characteristic of allegiance. W. L. Miller, in a remark on nationalism, seconds this thought.

Since this is a strong and passionate loyalty (to one's country) -- the highest one in real effect for a great part of our people -- it tends to reach out and gather every other loyalty to it, subordinating these to its passionate purpose. It does so with respect to religious faith and religious affirmation. . . . For example: The tendency to compose a creed, required of all Americans by compulsion, appears both including and excluding religious components.¹⁶

The creed might be the Pledge of Allegiance or some other statement.

¹⁵Wood, op. cit., p. 259.

¹⁶W. L. Miller, "Religion and Americanism," Journal of Church and State, V (1963), 22.

The subordinating done in the context of the creed and reinforced by it further exalts the State in its claim for allegiance.

The subordination of loyalties creates an attitude of superiority. Superiority is not bad of itself. However, the superiority of allegiance can issue in hostility and coercion.

'State,' indeed, is not to be equated with 'society.' But neither is it something different from society. Rather, it is a function of society -- namely . . . society as a whole acting with the ability to compel . . . this ability which derives finally from cultural myths of legitimation, is not necessarily expressed in the form of raw physical coercion. Indeed, it rarely is. But the capacity for such physical coercion is ultimately the monopoly of the state as defined.¹⁷

An important distinction between the present status of the Church and the State is made clear. The Church has little or no physical power and particularly in the Western world, little psychological leverage to coerce obedience to the claim of allegiance. The impact of allegiance is basically twofold. Allegiance, which is the demand of a circumscribing experience, is not another kind of loyalty. It is a different quality of loyalty and is, in fact, so unique as to be

¹⁷P. Wogaman, "The Changing Role of Government and the Myth of Separation," Journal of Church and State, V (1963), 65 and corresponding footnote, 65. Kelley makes another unfortunate statement in a hostile way from his allegiance to his "Christian" faith. "Have we Christians lost our confidence in our ability to stand up for our faith against all comers? How can it hurt us for another man to be a Catholic, a Moslem, a Communist? Why should he be silenced? For fear he will convert us? Rather leave us both free in the marketplace to testify, and we will convert all comers before we suffer them to convert us!" op. cit., p. 192. I'm sure this would cause our Roman brethren to ponder. If they are not Christian, what are they?

circumstantially different from loyalty. This issues in the assimilation of all aspects of life into the frame of reference of this superior relationship. Allegiance also ceases to be a cause or purpose and becomes a demand. The result of this is to establish an hierarchy of authority which is ultimately based in the legitimation of the experience. If the experience is legitimate, it carries a claim of obedient response. Coercion is one possibility of reinforcement of that allegiance.

C. AMBIGUITY IN ALLEGIANCE

It is at this point that the basic conflict of allegiance in Church-State relations can be more fruitfully defined. A quick survey of modern Church history will clearly indicate that the Church has repeatedly spoken against the State. The legitimacy of this disagreement must be evaluated from two positions. One, is the citizen of the State a Christian or not?¹⁸ If he is not, the Church positions may have no meaning for him. I am a Christian and hence I am compelled to speak to Church-State relations. Two, the relationship of Church and State will depend upon a definition of their constitutionality, the nature of the central idea. Beginning with my affirmation above, we shall go on to examine the nature of constitutionality in the Church and the State.

¹⁸The matter of whether we talk about a Christian citizen or a citizen Christian will hopefully become clear.

In today's world, there are basically two institutions which command allegiance of their constituents -- the Church and the State. Other institutions, primarily businesses, have tried to command the allegiance of employees but have at best received a stout loyalty. In most societies, businesses are subject to the prime idea of the State and hence cannot successfully reject it. Further, the scope of activity in organizing its members is much narrower in business than in the State. However, the State and the Church seek to conform the whole image of society to a directed and meaningful existence. Here the possibility of real conflict exists.

There are basically three possible relationships of Church and State. One, the State may command prime allegiance and the Church loyalty. Two, the Church may command prime allegiance and the State loyalty. Or, three, the two may claim a co-allegiance wherein, it is supposed, each institution covers complementary areas of influence. This last position has been the historical position of the Lutheran Church (the doctrine of two kingdoms). For an exhaustive study of this relationship, one should consult Helmut Thielicke's Theological Ethics, particularly the second volume, chapters 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 21 and 31.¹⁹ I remain unconvinced of Thielicke's Lutheran premise of the "ordained" nature of both State and Church.²⁰ The implication

¹⁹H. Thielicke, Theological Ethics (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.)

²⁰His statement on the State, which is the real area of contention, is nicely summarized on Ibid., II, 143f.

remains that one owes his allegiance to Christ, who is witnessed by the Church. In the end, Thielicke emphasizes the possibility of resistance to the State but not the Church. (See chapter 16, 326ff; chapter 20 and chapter 31.)²¹

The flavor of nationalism has been exhibited above. Much of the material cited was from the Journal of Church and State. Although the majority of articles which were read revealed a bias for the "separation" of Church and State, nearly every article which spoke to the problem of prime attachment, allegiance, supported allegiance to the Church. The State is cautioned again and again to limit itself to its proper task, the keeping of social order and protection from external oppression.

The believer holds that God stands over against and in judgment upon his nation, as upon every nation, and that the loyalty he tries to make ultimate and determinative of all the others is not the one to his nation, deep and powerful though that be, but his faith in the One God behind all the nations.²²

Concurring in this primacy of the faith of the Church, Kelley nearly redeems himself with:

One difficulty with the phrase 'Separation of Church and State' is that it says both too much and too little. It implies that religion has nothing, and should have nothing, to do with man's decisions in matters of state and public policy. This Christians will never accept.²³

²¹Ibid. A full discussion of Thielicke's work would be the substance of another paper.

²²Miller, op. cit., pp. 22f.

²³Kelley, op. cit., p. 187.

These statements of faith seem clear enough. The State's meaning is not defined. The meaning of existence is defined in terms of the Christian faith.

Others define the task of the State in terms of its relation to the Church.

The Christian religion needs to permeate every phase of life with its basic spiritual and moral concepts. Every realm should be brought under its influence and in a very real sense made to serve the purposes of God. The preceding means, among other things, that the State or government as such, as well as the Church, was founded by God and is to fulfill his purposes.²⁴

J. D. Roberts suggests much the same in more opaque language.

The conclusion is that the State in its collective composition and through its citizens should conceive of its origin, purpose, and destiny as being of God. It is an order of creation in that it is ordered by God to fulfill both creative and redemptive objectives.²⁵

Some authors even dare to circumscribe the role of the State altogether.

The State is no longer free to do as it wishes. It is subject to Christ. This explains a fundamental conviction of Christians in relation to earthly government. It cannot be the supreme authority over any man. The supreme authority is Jesus Christ, and He is the real arbiter of men's destiny when they are associated together to form a State . . .²⁶

²⁴T. B. Matson, "The Church, the State, and the Christian Ethic," Journal of Church and State, II (1960), 28. The final clause does not necessarily follow as Matson suggests. The first clause only means that all things are to be evaluated, not constituted, by God's purpose.

²⁵J. D. Roberts, "A Theological Conception of the State," Journal of Church and State, IV (1962), 74.

²⁶R. T. Jones, "Christian Doctrine," Catholic Quarterly, XXXI (1953), 314.

Father Murray's position in The Church in the World sounds the note of Roman harmony.

. . .the function of government appears as the protection and promotion, not of religious truth, but as a functional right of the human person. This is a secular function, since freedom in society -- notably religious freedom -- is a secular value, as are the values of justice and love or civic friendship.²⁷

He continues

The freedom of the Church is not merely a true principle, it is the fundamental principle governing the relations of the Church with all governments.²⁸

These positions seem clear enough, especially the last two.

The State is a function of society which numbers among its duties and tasks the protection of religious freedom which is the basis for evaluation of life. Yet ambiguity exists.

Ambiguity arises in Church-State relations for a number of reasons. One reason is that both institutions seem to have the same goals. Father Murray's astute statement on values in society is helpful. Justice, love, civic friendship, and freedom are goals of both the State and the Church. States, however, are by nature self-motivated institutions. The Church is not. What is judged by the State as being an action taken to insure freedom may not be so judged by the Church. The tragic example of Vietnam or the escalation of our

²⁷J. C. Murray, "The Issue of Church and State at Vatican Council II," in C. P. O'Donnell (ed.), In the Church in the World (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1968), p. 43.

²⁸Ibid., p. 46.

defense machinery provide ready examples. The State is national and nationalistic. The Church is international and should not be nationalistic. The peripheral vision of the Church gives different perspectives to values which in name, at least, are shared with the State. The difficulty of distinguishing cultural values from doctrinal values is even greater in the Christian State.

In many respects, the battle lines between Christian faith and secular nationalism may be more easily drawn than between Christian faith and a 'Christian' nationalism.²⁹

It is my contention that another reason that ambiguity arises is that the State reinforces its nationalism far more effectively than the Church reinforces Christianity. It may be remembered that acts of allegiance are unique in practice. They are generally distinguishable. Further, they reinforce without necessarily revealing or repeating the constitutional position of the institution. Thus, while one may agree with the prime claim to allegiance of the Church as the body of Christ when it is presented systematically, that same person submits to the barrage of appeals and demands which the State promotes. In the totalitarian State, the claim is made on the whole of life. More commonly, the State "allows" the Church to claim the realm of the "Spirit" while it lays claim on the "mundane" problems of life in the world. So Kelley suggests,

It is one of the chief characteristics of a State Religion that in its rites, religious devotion and patriotism become inextricably

²⁹Wood, op. cit., p. 261.

mingled.³⁰

In totalitarian States the rightful mission and message of the Church are severely circumscribed to 'spiritual matters.' The right of the Church to speak out on economic, political, and social questions is expressly denied in order that the church conform to the State's concept of the role of religion.³¹

Allegiance should be based on the constitution of the institution. Is the central idea truly a master laying claim upon us? Does the idea or person have the right to ultimate authority over us, or does it merely have the power? The legitimation of the claim should be acknowledged. Repeated acts of allegiance create a consciousness which cause an emotional confusion in the Christian citizen. The seeming congruency of national and Christian goals further obscures any real differences.

A third area in which ambiguity is enlarged is a common heritage. We in the United States have an unusually difficult history to sort. We have believed that the colonies were founded to insure religious freedom and that the early colonists were a very "church" group. Serious reservations arise at the mention of these opinions. The enfranchisement policies of most of the colonies and the low percentage of church members casts doubts on these beliefs. Our attitude of the "new Jerusalem," the feeling of "manifest destiny," our belief in "one nation under God," these feelings of political and theological congruency have contributed to the politico-theological flavoring of our

³⁰Kelley, op. cit., p. 184.

³¹Wood, op. cit., p. 257.

history.³² We have felt that this is a Christian nation. Whether or not this is true is something to be determined by history and the final judgment. We have felt that our history has had the hand of God directing it. These attitudes are shared in common with the nations of western Europe. One of the interesting phenomena which we do not share is the disenfranchisement of the Church. This has meant a number of things. One, our national tone has been Anabaptist, Church and State are to be separated. Two, disenfranchisement has meant the limiting of power of the Church. Most of our energies have been exerted in inter-Church squabbles and conflict. Little energy has been expended in confronting the State and the society. Three, the great emphasis on democracy as a prime value in life, the strong position of the non-churched and the Baptist groups in the expansion era of our history, and the disenfranchised position of the Church has given little in the way of support for the idea of the Church. The Church has been and remains fragmented in practice and in theory. It is not surprising, then, that coupled with the "religious" overtones of our national history, the Church (if the churches did conceive of themselves as one Church) is not a strong voice in this country.³³

³²See H. R. Niebehr, The Kingdom of God in America (Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String Press. 1956.)

³³The feeling that the Church doesn't speak for me is a consistent attitude for those enamored with democracy. This is not to deprecate democracy but rather to question its automatic inclusion in the polity and process of the Church.

D. SOME OBSERVATIONS

It may be fruitful at this point to "sum up" the discussion. Allegiance is an unique relationship of Lord to servant. It is a relationship that is acknowledged by the servant who recognizes the right of the Lord to claim his allegiance. Two statements are crucial. R. Tudor Jones emphasis, "Christ is Lord. That is the standpoint of faith."³⁴ Karl Rahner says, "We learn that the Church is not a purely voluntary association of a democratic kind, established by men, but one whose fundamental rights, duties, and purposes were established by God."³⁵ The key here is that Christ is Lord. He is never president. He is never subject to election. He is acknowledged. At this point in the faith, there is little discussion. If, as I have suggested, allegiance is based upon this central idea, then it has its own internal legitimation. "Lord" is its own legitimation. Hence, the legitimation of the central idea is crucial.

Allegiance also causes an ordering of loyalties. All loyalties derive their significance from their relationship to the prime relationship of allegiance. Value and meaning are derivatives of this primal attachment, too. Hierarchies of loyalties are not necessarily explicit but are implied. Acts of allegiance, which are of an unique

³⁴Jones, op. cit.

³⁵K. Rahner, Theology for Renewal (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1964.), p. 5.

category, reinforce the feeling of allegiance. Acts of allegiance need not necessarily be related to the legitimation of allegiance. Thus, a State which lays no formal, constitutional claim on its citizens may reinforce an attitude of allegiance by promoting acts of allegiance. Finally, ambivalence in allegiance may arise when reinforcement is used to support an institution without a legitimate claim (like the State) and an institution with a legitimate claim does not use reinforcement (like the Church). Or, ambivalence may arise when the two institutions have nearly congruent histories and much common language (which is really inevitable). The ambiguity becomes more severe when one institution (the State) has a strong notion of centrality and has power and when another institution (the Church) has little notion of unity and centrality and has little power.

CHAPTER II

ANALYSES OF SOME TEXTS CONCERNING ALLEGIANCE

IN CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS IN ISRAEL

A. GIDEON

The story of Gideon introduces into Israel's history the possibility of monarchy. The introduction of monarchy in Israel's history gave rise to a continuing discussion on the legitimation of State authority and the relationship of the faith to the government. The story of Gideon, from Judges 6-8 is most probably the composite result of at least two strands of tradition. Rad suggests that the early tradition is couched in the theological context of a later, detached position.¹ A few preliminary remarks about Gideon and his office of judge are appropriate.

Gideon may or may not be the real name of the hero in Jd 6-8. Gideon, meaning "hewer," may simply be an appellation given to the hero as a result of his victories over the Midianites. It is possible that his real name may have been Jerubbaal. This is the name given to Abimelech's father in Jd 9:1, 2, 16f. The acceptability of the "baal" element in the name may indicate an early use of the name wherein

¹See C. F. Kraft, "Gideon," in Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), II, 394. Also, G. F. Moore, (Edinburg: Clark, 1895), xxi. And, C. F. Burney, The Book of Judges (New York: KTAV, 1970), 176. G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), I, 60f.

"baal" might have meant simply "lord" or "master." On the other hand, Jerubbaal and Gideon may not be the same person at all. Internal evidences support this, cf 7:1, 8:35. The interplay of the names in 8:29ff adds confusion to the lot.² The latter is to be preferred on the internal grounds despite the action of Gideon against the altars of Baal, Jd 7:25ff. Burney suggests that 6:25ff is certainly different from the preceding, which is Yahwistic, and is thus probably later. He also suggests that the key verses for our study, 8:22ff, are also later.³ The consistency of this strand is based upon a rejection of idolatrous worship. The rejection of the Kingship in ch. 8 is more problematic and will be discussed shortly.

If Gideon is the actor in the two strands of narrative, his office seems to be that of a "judge" of Israel, although this title is never given to him. Gideon possessed the ability to win military victories against great odds. A true charismatic leader, Gideon had special revelations (Jd 6:11-32; 6:36-40) and unusual power.⁴ He was a "judge" in the sense that he was a deliverer and one who kept peace in the land because of his influence, cf Jd 8:28. With these preliminary statements given for background, let us examine the key passage, Jd 8:22f.

²Cf. Kraft, op. cit.

³Burney, op. cit., pp. 179 and 183 (E²)

⁴C. F. Kraft, "Book of Judges," in Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, II, 1017.

This suggests that the text in Judges is consonant with the Deuteronomistic thought of the corpus in which it stands. Moore makes a clear response to this implication. "A later writer (D) would have no visible motive for introducing the offer and rejection of the Kingdom in this place."⁸

However, if 8:22f is of the E stratum, it would not make sense with the Ephraimites being in such a "truculent" mood in 8:1-3.⁹ Moore suggests that this text is probably E² which would draw support from the corresponding passages in Samuel (see above).¹⁰ By accepting the literary judgment of E², we must anticipate a negative attitude toward the monarchy on theological grounds. That position will be discussed in a moment.

There are other problems with this passage which obscure its meaning in its context. Two of those problems are worthy of note. First, Gideon is said to be victorious over the Midianites with 300 men of his own tribe. The other tribes only assisted in the victory.¹¹ A "haughty" Ephraim would not very likely be asking Gideon to rule over her because he had "saved" her from the Midianites.¹² This casts

⁸Moore, op. cit., p. 229.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid. So, also Burney, op. cit.

¹¹J. M. Myers, "The Book of Judges," in Interpreter's Bible, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953), II, 743.

¹²Burney, op. cit., p. 235 and Myers, Ibid., p. 745.

doubts on the continuity of 8:22f in the rest of the chapter. The flattery that Gideon uses in 8:4 seems to appease Ephraim's temper. What seems certain in this text is the asking of Gideon to rule, whether or not it was "all of Israel". The E² stratum makes the "all of Israel" language understandable in that the Kingship is tied to Israel and not a peculiar tribe.

The second difficulty comes from an implication in the Abimelech narrative. Burney suggests,

As a matter of fact, Gideon's sons do seem to have become hereditary sheikhs of Shechem, by virtue of the office transmitted by their father: cf Ch. 9:2, where the verb māṣal, 'rule,' is the same as is employed in 8:23. . .¹³

This would seem to indicate that Gideon ruled with the right to have his sons rule after him. These two thoughts make the text 8:22f all the more opaque.

Nevertheless, some observations can be made concerning this text. Gideon is a man with extraordinary talents. He was, at the very least, a successful warrior. The Midianites, marauding bands of nomads, were evidently greatly feared, for even Gideon threshed wheat in the winepress so as not to get caught (cf 6:11). Beating these invaders and pursuing them and decimating their number was quite a feat. Even if the odds (135,000:300) seem unbelievable, the matter of success is the important element to remember. It is understandable that the people would go to Gideon to request him to rule. He was the

¹³Burney, op. cit., p. 184. We must be careful to distinguish the use of לָשַׁל from לָשַׁל, which is reserved for Yahweh.

leader. That "the men of Israel" asked this of Gideon suggests that the rule is not to be seen as that of a tribal sheikhdom. Rather, it is a general rulership over Israel, which means at least more than one tribe.¹⁴

There are two elements in the rule which are stated. The first is that Gideon rule. The verb is the same as the one used for Abimelech, as noted above. This is also different from the terminology used to describe the control of the judges, cf. 3:30; 5:31; 8:28; 10:2, 3; 12:7, 12:10 and so on. The verb implies a political ruler probably of the same kind as Israel's contemporaries. The second element is more crucial. A distinguishing characteristic of this kind of rule is that the office is to be hereditary. This willful subjection of themselves to dynastic rule puts the Israelites in a unique position. With seeming ingratitude for their deliverance, Israel wants to cause a break with her history. This is probably not true. I would suggest that the conditions of rulership betray a desire to be "like the other nations." It is not that Gideon is so great or wise. Rather, it is Israel desiring the stability of leadership that other peoples appear to have. This feeling is supported by the analysis of the literary stratum, the shift from the particular tribal setting to "the men of Israel," and the suspicion that Gideon did rule, not only as a judge, but in such fashion as to create the legitimacy of a

¹⁴Moore suggests that Mannasseh and Ephraim must be included in this number and perhaps the others mentioned in 7:23. Moore, op. cit., p. 229.

dynastic heir.¹⁵ Certainly, the text does not indicate finally the nature of the rule. However, the implication is that Gideon is desired to rule like the Kings. The final subordinate clause in 8:22 adds further weight. The reason for the request is because of the ability of Gideon to keep away invaders. This does not imply theological reasons but solely political ones.

Gideon's response changes the whole tenor of the passage. He first responds to each of the elements in the appeal for rulership and then responds with his reason. This symmetrical response may indicate a literary construction. I could find no evidence of this. Even so, the symmetry allows for a division in the response of two parts. The first part answers each element of the twofold request separately. Gideon will not rule. Neither will his sons rule. This causes some problem in interpretation. If Gideon does not rule, why should there be any question of his sons' rule? There are two possibilities to explain this problematic construction. One, it is purely literary and requires a twofold negative response to maintain symmetry. Or, two, there are two separate conditions which are being asked of Gideon. Will he rule? And, will he accept a system of hereditary rule? The proper conclusion is not yet apparent to me. I suspect, however, that Gideon's refusal of the first condition, that is his reigning, logically precludes his favorable response to the second condition.

¹⁵Cf. Myers, op. cit., p. 748.

Gideon's response to the reason for Israel's request sets the character of the pericope. "The Lord will rule over you." Yahweh is meant here. To a political reason, Gideon gives a theological response. This is to say that Gideon refused to see Israel's condition determined from a political perspective. Politics are not necessarily evil. The reason Gideon gives is directed toward Israel and is made in a positive fashion. You, Israel, have a peculiar relationship to Yahweh. He has called up deliverers for you from among his people. Gideon sees himself in that light. His is a religious office. One which has its genesis in Yahweh's calling. Yahweh will rule. This is not a denial of a particular political system but an evaluation of what a particular people can request. The particular people, Israel, is a community defined by faith more than politics. Hence, they are to be defined in the world by that faith. This attitude need not reflect a period late in the Kingdom as Moore claims.¹⁶ Other evidences still merit the consideration of an earlier tradition which suspects the Kingdom as a thwarting of Yahweh's presence in Israel.

Yahweh is King here. This is true theocracy, rule of God. Yahweh rules. He protects his people as long as they are faithful. He sends enemies against them when they are not. When they repent, he calls forth deliverers from their midst. This is the pattern of divine history which is repeated again and again in Judges. Gideon's refusal

¹⁶Moore, op. cit., p. 230.

of the Kingship is consonant with that pattern. The symmetry of the request and response help to clarify the nature of the response. The conditions for peace and stability are reasoned from a political standpoint. Gideon rejects politics as a determinative criterion for Israel. All of Israel's life is determined by her relationship to Yahweh. Israel is a theological concept, here.

Some Pertinent Conclusions: There is only one direct and clear allegiance for Israel. Yahweh rules over them. She must recognize that her relationship to Yahweh is a matter of faith and that a political system acting as a mediary between intruders and Israel's desires for peace and security is not available to her. Gideon's refusal is more than a personal verdict; it is a systematic statement. Israel is wholly defined on theological grounds here. There is no relationship which does not directly derive from Yahweh.

The acceptability of judges is based upon their calling by Yahweh, their empowerment by Yahweh, and their acceptance by Yahweh. The judge may act as a civil magistrate. He may have despotic control over the people.¹⁷ He may be successful and popular. But, he does not "rule." Neither will his sons rule. Yahweh alone rules. Even though, in practice, the judges were civil magistrates, the systematic statement in Jd 8 implies that the civil activities are peripheral in terms of Israel's prime relationship with Yahweh. They are deliverers called up to deliver a repentant Israel.

¹⁷ J. F. Lias, The Book of Judges. (Cambridge: University Press, 1890), pp. 16f.

B. SAUL

The Kingship in Israel really begins with Saul. Abimelech's short reign was not succeeded by another King's reign. Saul's short reign is succeeded by David and his dynasty. The Kingship becomes a lasting institution with Saul. It is important, then, to look at the texts pertaining to Saul's ascendancy to the throne and his rejection. There are three stories of Saul's rise to the throne. Two, I Sam 8 and I Sam 10:17-27, represent later traditions. The third, I Sam 9-10, represents an earlier tradition. Only I Sam 8 and I Sam 9f will be discussed here because these two show clearly enough the spectrum of feeling about the Kingship which has characterized Israel. We will begin with a brief look at the earlier story.

1. The interesting and lively account of Saul's search for the lost asses is most probably the reflection of an historical event. The characters and the situations are most vivid. The personal relationship of Samuel and Saul is described in the warm tones which are congruent with the other Samuel-Saul texts.¹⁸ This earlier tradition represents a favorable attitude toward the Kingship.¹⁹ The divine

¹⁸H. W. Hertzberg, I and II Samuel (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964), p. 78.

¹⁹J. M. Myers, "Saul Son of Kish," in Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, IV, 230.

intervention which creates the situation in which Saul and Samuel meet is an endorsement of not only the meeting but also of the institution which Yahweh establishes.

The genealogy of Saul sets up a continuing criterion of Yahweh's calling from his people. Saul is a Benjaminite. W. McKane suggests that Kish is a wealthy and powerful man.²⁰ This certainly doesn't make sense with Saul's own confession in 9:21. Noth suggests that Kish was probably a freeman who was self-supported by agriculture. But, certainly, this is not a sign of wealth.²¹ Saul is described as a handsome, physical man (I Sam 9:2). This disparity of characteristics is consistent with the theocratic theology of the Old Testament. Yahweh calls forth deliverers from the least of his people. Saul is Kingly in stature but not in place in society.

The meeting with Samuel, whom Saul seeks as a "man of God," a "seer," is climaxed by Samuel's anointing Saul as a nagid, a prince, over Israel. Samuel has been told earlier that the man whom Yahweh sends is to be anointed nagid and that he will save His (Yahweh's) afflicted people. Here, the prince is regarded "to be the gift of God to his people, to deliver them from the double danger of Philistine oppression and intertribal disunity and strife."²² This attitude

²⁰W. McKane, I and II Samuel (London: SCM Press, 1963), p. 69.

²¹Noth, op. cit., p. 168.

²²G. B. Caird, "The First and Second Books of Samuel," in Interpreter's Bible, II, 927.

of Yahweh's concern for his people is confirmed by Rad.

The older (account of Saul's becoming King) lets the reader understand the event wholly in the context of Jahweh and his plan -- it is concerned with the historical unfolding of Jahweh's saving will.²³

There are several significant elements to be discerned in the anointing of Saul. First, it is Samuel, the chief priest and seer among the people, who does the will of Yahweh. Samuel has been denied worthy sons to succeed him in his office. However, he is still the recipient of Yahweh's revelation. The act of anointing is a common symbolic act in coronation. This act stamps "a special character, which never disappears," on Saul.²⁴ The act of Samuel's kissing Saul is not to be seen as a symbolic act but, rather, a sign of Samuel's affection for Saul.²⁵ This affection is probably the outgrowth of Samuel's recognition of Saul's favor with Yahweh. Confirmation of the consecration is to be given Saul in the experience of two events, he will meet two men at the border of Benjamin who will tell him that the asses have been found and that he will meet a band of prophets and will become "another man."

These proofs of Yahweh's calling and the attribute of saving warrior make Saul no different from the judges. They, too, were

²³Rad, op. cit., I, 326.

²⁴Hertzberg, op. cit., p. 84.

²⁵H. P. Smith, The Books of Samuel (Edinburgh: Clark, 18), p. 67.

called of God and were subject to special revelation. They, too, were to deliver Israel from her enemies. However, they were not told to rule as nagid over the people Israel. They were not anointed. The anointing that Saul receives is special, not because of the substance, but because of the one who does the anointing.²⁶ This suggests that an important element of Saul's authority rests in the person who gives it to him. It is a man of God who consecrates Saul. It is Samuel who gives the word as to the nature of the consecration, nagid.

One final event occurs which is recounted to substantiate Saul's claim to divine consecration. The Spirit of the Lord does come upon him as Samuel said it would. Saul is taken by the Spirit. He is directed by the Spirit. He is, in effect, an instrument of Yahweh. He is not able to control his own destiny.

It is said that 'the spirit of God came mightily upon' Saul, and this description brings out both the violence of its effect and the unpredictability of its coming.²⁷

These signs, which Samuel foretells, are probably for Saul's benefit. They are recounted here, no doubt, for the reader's benefit. Saul is to be an instrument of Yahweh. That is his function. Samuel's warning, "Now when these signs meet you, do whatever your hand finds to do, for God is with you," (I Sam 10:7), emphasizes the presence of Yahweh in Saul's activity. The meaning of the anointing and the giving

²⁶Hertzberg, op. cit.

²⁷Caird, op. cit., p. 934. With the previous knowledge of these signs as declared by Samuel, Saul need not be thoroughly unaware of when they will come.

of the title is to symbolically express the reality that God is with Saul.

2. The later source speaks of the Kingship in a negative way. I Sam 8 reflects an attitude of critical reflection on years of disaster under the monarchy.

The later (source), which casts up the account of a long experience with Kings, views the monarchy as an institution which fell victim to the people's clutches, as a sacrifice to reasons of state. For this way of understanding the monarchy, it became the standard view that, because of her Kings, Israel became 'like the nations' (I Sam 8:5, 20) and that she thereby rejected the rule of Jahweh (I Sam 8:7, 12:12).²⁸

The background for the people's request for a king suggests the desire of the people for justice and peace. Samuel has appointed his sons to be judges over Israel.

Joel and Abijah fail in the judicial trust which has been reposed in them. They are judges at Beersheba, but they are carried away by greed and are amenable to bribery, so that they cease to administer and defend justice.²⁹

The people see this "maladministration of justice" as a sufficient reason to ask for a King (8:5).³⁰ In 8:20, the additional reason is given that the King would be a leader in battle. The feeling for justice and peace are commendable. The direction in which the people turn is not.

There are three elements which betray the dynamics of this

²⁸Rad, op. cit.

²⁹McKane, op. cit., p. 64.

³⁰Smith, op. cit., p. 56.

text. First, there is the interaction of Samuel and the people. Second, there is the interaction of the Lord and Samuel. And, third, there is the attitude of the narrative which sets the tone for those dialogues. The third element may have preceded the other two, yet it will be helpful to see the first two elements before the third so that the tone of the writer's mind may become clear.

The first element considers Samuel and the people. The people are straightforward enough in their evaluation of Samuel's sons (8:5). Their request of Samuel implies that the judges at this time were considered primarily in their civil roles. The people want administrative leadership and honesty. No theological motive is given for their request. At the same time, though, the people do not take it upon themselves to create a kingship. They still go to Samuel, the cultic as well as civil leader of Israel. This inconsistency is explained by the people's dependency on existing leadership to provide for the future. Samuel was the recognized leader of the community. Where else could the people receive better advice. Further, Samuel had evidently been given the power to appoint his successors, for he had already appointed his sons as judges. The phrase, "like all the nations," reinforces the political context from which the people speak.

The second element is the interaction between Samuel and Yahweh. It is no surprise that Samuel responds immediately to the people's request by praying to Yahweh. This act of piety and the special relationship that Samuel had with Yahweh are characteristic of other texts concerning Samuel (cf I Sam 3f). The Lord's reaction to the

people's request (what Samuel said is not reported) is anger. Yahweh sees the political request in light of the special relationship that Israel has to Him. Hence, Yahweh's reaction is and can only be theological.

The issue is a fundamental one, but it is not between Samuel and Israel; it is between Yahweh and Israel . . . What is ultimately implied in this request for a king is that Israel prefers to rely on a monarchy of a worldly pattern rather than on the Kingship of Yahweh.³¹

Yahweh accepts the request of the people and only asks that Samuel tell the people what they will get when they receive what they want. The people have a chance to listen to Samuel but they do not hear his words. Yahweh concedes them their choice, a choice which will mete them their just desserts.

The third element may well have preceded the other two. The narrative knows of the reality of the Kingship. It also knows of the ways of kings (8:10-18). The theological justification of this disastrous history is a faith in theocracy. Caird sees the underlying attitude of the text.

The crux of the elders' offense seems to have been that they wanted Israel to be 'like all the nations.' The essential difference between Israel and the heathen nations lay just in this, that the Lord was their King who ruled them through his representative the priest or judge. It might be objected that the Lord could equally well rule them through his representative the king, and that was the view taken in the early source. But the institution of the monarchy involved the separation of the civil from the religious leadership, and this in turn meant that Israel now began to have a political history which was independent of her religious history and therefore of her true calling.³²

³¹McKane, op. cit., p. 65.

³²Caird, op. cit., pp. 918f. So, also, Noth, op. cit., p. 172.

This fundamental attitude in favor of the theocracy and against the monarchy is not a statement forbidding monarchy. Rather, it is a statement which in effect says, "If Israel chooses to live without the continued leadership of Yahweh, then she shall suffer the fruits of the way she chooses." This attitude allows for some success with the monarchy, perhaps even some divine guidance. The end result, though, is clear. The monarchy is not sufficient for Israel because it rejects the singular leadership of Yahweh.

3. Saul's rejection by Yahweh is an unique story. Saul disobeys Yahweh's commandment only twice and for this he loses the kingship. Yahweh's favor is no longer with him (cf I Sam 13:8-14 and 15). Saul commits the same mistake twice. The two traditions appear not to have taken the other into account for Saul is told twice that Yahweh rejects him.

The rejection story in ch. 13 is out of context. It is probably a later addition to the text. The sequence is interrupted. On the meaning of the text, Caird opines,

One would have thought, too, that Samuel's failure to keep his word would have absolved Saul from all responsibility toward him, especially since with undisciplined troops, delay was bound to mean defection. But the author apparently believed that the role of king was subordinate to that of prophet, and that it was a sin³³ for Saul to take any decisive step without the command of Samuel.

Caird's statement makes Saul's rejection appear as a rejection of Samuel's legitimate claim to power. Noth goes even further. He suggests

³³Ibid., pp. 947f.

that Samuel, who played an important role in getting Saul elected (following the tradition in I Sam 9-10:16, cf Noth 168f),

rejected the consequences which flowed inevitably from the establishment of the monarchy, and made himself the spokesman of the old traditions, to which no doubt large sections of the Israelite tribes felt themselves committed. In fact, when Saul now pursued, as he was bound to do, his own way as king, Samuel retracted the call which he had previously issued to Saul and declared that Saul had been 'rejected' by God.³⁴

If one reads ch. 13 in isolation, Noth's secular viewpoint is understandable. However, this text must be understood from the viewpoint of the writer which is considerably later. For example, the writer has Samuel saying that Yahweh has given his favor to another man, who we and the author know to be David. The narrative sequence doesn't deal with David's anointing until ch. 16. Caird's attractive argument for the lateness of the text³⁵ is surely correct. It is from this viewpoint that meaning in the text is to be sought.

Hertzberg perceives the situation. He begins by seeing Caird's and Noth's perspectives.

If anyone is wrong here it is Samuel, and not Saul. But if we look at the history of Saul as a whole, the contrary is intended. The compiler of the work means to convey here what is elsewhere expressed in connection with sentences like v. 1: the king 'did what was evil in the sight of the Lord.' It is his purpose to show that Saul's kingship was perverted right from the beginning; the first king trod a path with which the Lord was not pleased.³⁶

³⁴Noth, op. cit., p. 176.

³⁵Caird, op. cit., p. 863f.

³⁶Hertzberg, op. cit., p. 106.

The real historical event and its accompanying dynamics are not intended to be the determining factors here. Noth may or may not be right about what actually happened. The meaning of what happened is determined by the theocratic opinion of the compiler.

One further comment should be made on this text. The statement that Saul's kingdom would have been secure forever had he not disobeyed Yahweh is interesting and puzzling. How Saul disobeyed is not precisely clear.³⁷ Yet, why the statement that Saul's kingdom would have endured? One does not find this promise implied in the election texts. It must be supposed that this, too, is to be seen from the later perspective. David is promised a dynasty which will have no end. Does the later writer suppose that the same promise would have been given Saul had the latter remained faithful? This attitude, however, does not make sense with the basic rejection of monarchy in this later strand. This problem remains a puzzle. Fortunately, it doesn't obscure the prime intent of the passage.

The longer rejection narrative in ch. 15 exhibits the markings of the later compiler. The favorable attitude toward the kingship in 15:1ff implies that this material is based upon the earlier source, cf. I Sam 9-10:16. Hertzberg affirms that it is difficult to put this chapter in sequence in the Saul history. His opinion is that it should follow ch. 11.³⁸ His manipulations and contortions with the

³⁷Caird, op. cit., p. 864.

³⁸Hertzberg, op. cit., pp. 123f.

text do not alleviate the severe problems which the Saul texts present.

He makes another allegation which further weakens his case.

For the compiler of the whole work, the details of ch. 13, which has no express mention of the rejection, represent the lightning, while the storm breaks in ch. 15. Therefore the narrative of David's anointing, to which 15:28 expressly refers, follows immediately on this account.³⁹

Smith, in ICC, draws the opposite, and the more supportable, solution.

This chapter, like 13:4-15, reads as if it were the only account of Saul's rejection. But the common features are striking. . . The conclusion is obvious: though the two accounts are taken from two separate documents, and though each formed, in the history of which it was a part, the sole account of the rejection of Saul, yet they are derived from a common tradition, or one is dependent on the other.⁴⁰

The interweaving of late compilation and edition with the earlier source makes it difficult to locate a "proper" sequence. The tradition is firm that Saul is rejected. It is less crucial, then, to know where the text belongs than to accept the reality of the rejection, which is not debated. If, then, ch. 15 can be viewed without direct connection with the other Saul texts, some observations similar to those on ch. 13 may be recorded.

The mediator of the rejection is Samuel, who has many functions in these stories. He is prophet, priest, judge, mediator for Yahweh

³⁹ Ibid., p. 124. Is there really no "express mention of the rejection" in ch. 13. 13:14 seems clear.

⁴⁰ Smith, op. cit., p. 129. This does not mean that the compiler did not recognize that he had two accounts of the rejection. The anointing is already implied in ch. 13. One needn't wait until 15:28. The connection of 13 and 15 in Hertzberg look artificial. Each rejection story has its own finality.

and His people. Saul is rejected on theological grounds. Saul was to have carried on a holy war. He was Israel's deliverer, Yahweh's anointed. "It was his sin that he waged this war after the fashion of other wars; that was regarded as a profanation of the realm of the holy."⁴¹ Saul's rejection is final. All that is left to him is to watch for the one "after God's heart" to take away his kingdom. The command of Yahweh was made clear before the campaign against the Amalekites. His sin, not explicitly fulfilling Yahweh's orders, is repeated after the fact by Samuel. The offense is not seen in a final way by Saul. Hertzberg states,

...Saul has evidently not understood the seriousness of the situation. In his eyes, what has happened seems to be a 'transgression' (abar), as v. 24b clearly shows, in other words a failing which is expiable in the usual way; hence the form of his request to Samuel.⁴²

4. Saul has moved from the chosen one of Yahweh, His anointed one, to the rejected king whose kingdom will be torn from him as Saul tore Samuel's skirt. The impact of the story of Saul leaves clear markings. The kingship is seen as the desire of Yahweh's people. The people want a king and Yahweh gives them Saul. There is no need to harmonize the disparate views of the kingship. Both attitudes add to the fullness of the problem.

The desire of the people is seen as a rejection of the final authority of Yahweh over them. At best, the earlier source only

⁴¹Hertzberg, op. cit., p. 126.

⁴²Ibid., p. 128.

indicates that what Yahweh had hitherto done through judges, he will now do through his nagid. The anointed here is not king but a prince. The difference is surely intentional. This suggests Yahweh's willingness to work through different structures in order to sustain His relationship with the people.

Secondly, the decision that "like the nations" means a rejection of Yahweh betrays the perspective of Yahweh (and the writer). Israel is the congregation of faith. This is why she has a peculiar relationship to Yahweh. To seek to be as "the nations" is to reject the reality and heritage of who she is. This attempt by the people to define themselves politically is a misunderstanding of their basic nature.

Thirdly, Saul is both king and prototype of the relationship of Yahweh to the kingdom.

Saul is the inaugurator of the kingdom. But the King set over the people of God must be a man of God's grace, called by him and a real instrument in his hand. This Saul is not. To this extent, the history of the beginning of the kingdom at the same time also provides the theological evaluation of the kingdom in Israel. The first king is like a sign pointing towards the true kingly office, but at the same time also a sign showing that the man who holds this office can come to grief in it. Only he who allows God to be wholly king, and who is therefore himself completely obedient, can be king over the people of God. The first king is measured strictly by this standard and cannot come up to it.⁴³

This observation is the key. The later compiler cannot erase Saul's ascension to the kingship. He can, however, evaluate his reign and rejection. That evaluation is that although Yahweh would and could

⁴³ Ibid., pp. 133f.

work through a King and a kingdom, both had to remain ultimately committed to him. Saul disobeyed Yahweh's command and he was rejected. For the compiler, Israel disobeyed Yahweh's command and the kingdom was rejected.

An Evaluation of the Saul Texts:

4. These Saul narratives suggest a tone for the texts from the compiler's perspective. The two variant traditions acknowledge the presence of the kingship. The earlier tradition represents an interesting picture of complementary charismatic officers. The office of judge had been established. The chief judge, Samuel, was also the special recipient of revelation from Yahweh. Samuel's auditory experience reveals Saul as the newly chosen charismatic leader of his people. Saul is given two signs to assure him of his election. Saul's function is essentially that of judge, but his office is that of king. This tradition implies an adapted form of theocracy (Yahweh as true king and Saul as his representative). Allegiance is still to Yahweh. Saul's office is no longer solely cultic. The office of king is, at this point, a modest secular expansion of cultic functions.

The later tradition implies the subordination of this new class of office, with its charismatic holder, to the established charismatic leadership of Samuel. One must surmise that Samuel's calling has precedent over Saul's. Further, whereas the earlier tradition indicates the acceptability of the kingship as a means of continued allegiance to Yahweh, the later tradition points up the possi-

bilities of ambiguity in that office (I Sam 8:10ff). Saul's guilt is not akin to these practices of kings. The king is seen, in I Sam 8, as a burden to his people by his "secular" demands. Saul is rejected on theological grounds. He has usurped Samuel's prerogative. This attitude betrays a highly superior feeling for the cultic. Allegiance and obedience are consistently due to Yahweh through the cult.

There is only a weak idea of the political office of king in these texts. The political nature of the office has little depth to the Israelite consciousness. Saul's office is primarily that of consecrated warrior (I Sam 9:15f). The crimes he commits are religious in nature and are the cause of his downfall. Here Israel is still the Yahweh entity that it was in Jd 6-8. Allegiance is still seen in cultic-theological language. Allegiance is a category of theocratic structure. Although a charismatic leader be raised up to deliver Israel from her enemies, the primary relationship of Israel is to Yahweh, her God and king. Saul, as well as Samuel, remain as called charismatic functionaries who perform within contextual historical offices. Allegiance through the cult is the sole claim on Israel albeit the offices of administration and revelation are comparable to secular-religious offices elsewhere in the ancient Near East.

C. DAVID AND SOLOMON

1. Although the texts concerning David are many times the volume given over to Saul, the key transition in the development of the kingship and the kingdom is explained in two chapters, II Sam 6

and 7. The voluminous Davidic materials may be traced to the presence of a court biographer, a luxury that Saul did not have. Certainly David gave the kingship personal contours which have left their imprint throughout history. Nevertheless, in these two chapters, the critical relationship of Cult and State in Israel are determined.

II Sam 6 concerns David's bringing the Ark to Jerusalem. The Ark was one of two symbols which held great meaning for the Hebrews from before the settlement. The other, the Tent, became associated with each other in this story. Yet, it is the Ark, from the northern tribes, that is the issue. After the defeat of the Philistines, David set about to consolidate the kingdom. Caird captures the political genius of David's move.

David at once set about establishing Jerusalem as the new capital of his united kingdom. For this purpose it was admirably suited, both because of its natural strength as a fortress and because it lay exactly on the boundary between Judah and Benjamin, and so was neutral territory belonging neither to the north nor to the south. David's first step was to enhance the claims of Jerusalem to be the new national center by bringing up the ark, which had been the palladium of the northern confederacy of tribes under the leadership of Ephraim. . . At least we can say that David's political action must have allayed the incipient jealousy of the northern tribes.⁴⁴

This is an astute observation of what was happening. David's piety, attested to in myriad texts, is not the basis of his decision. Jerusalem, a city which he captured (II Sam 5:1-12), is known as David's city. David is king of two jealous entities.⁴⁵ The act of

⁴⁴ Caird, op. cit., p. 1076.

⁴⁵ The entities meant here are Israel and Judah, not Ammon and Jerusalem.

establishing a neutral site as the capital is reminiscent of the establishment of Washington, D.C. Yet, David has one additional problem. The tribes of Israel are related to Yahweh through a long history. Unity in the kingdom cannot be insured unless there is unity in worship. The Ark represents the presence of Yahweh. It is thought of as His throne.⁴⁶ By bringing this relic into the capital city, David infused a central sacral tradition with his political capital. Noth notes,

He (David) wanted to give this city the dignity pertaining to this central relic of the confederation of the twelve tribes and thus boldly linked to it the ancient sacral tradition which bound the tribes together, and thereby made use of it for his own ends. In fact, the position in world history which Jerusalem has occupied ever since is due to this very act.⁴⁷

Jerusalem is known as a religious center more so than a political center. Yet it appears that in this text the demands of the political reality were as neatly met as were the demands of the religious reality. At this particular juncture, there is little pressure of religious disunity put upon David.⁴⁸ It would be remarkably astute of David to foresee the competition of the local shrines with Jerusalem. Of course, if Jerusalem had not been made the center of the faith, little could be guessed as to the competition between shrines and

⁴⁶Rad, op.cit., I, 237. But see also n. 110 for its interesting literary analysis of Ark.

⁴⁷Noth, op. cit., p. 191.

⁴⁸In fact, religious division at a later time helps cause the split in the Kingdom.

capital sans Ark.

One final event in this text warrants attention. In II Sam 6:18, David blesses the people. This priestly function, along with David's sacrifice in 6:13, indicates that David was more than nagid and the Lord's anointed.⁴⁹ He was a priest, and, with the implication of this kind of action, among the chief of priests. It will be remembered that Saul was not permitted this function. The priestly function was reserved for Samuel. Whether, in this case, the implication is that the office of king had naturally assumed this function, or David's favor with Yahweh endowed him with this right, or, David functioned as priest by whatever authority and caused this function to attach to the kingship is difficult to say. At any rate, we see here the wedding of politics and its hierarchy and the cult and its functionaries in the person of David. At this point, one man acts, at least in specific instances, for both Church and State.⁵⁰

This last statement, of course, implies that there are two recognizable Israels -- the people of Yahweh and the nation. It would be an interesting study to see the growth of the dual personalities in Israel. But this is not our function, however familial the topic may be. That Israel functions as two entities in different situations is from this point on increasingly clear.

⁴⁹Cf. Smith, op. cit., pp. 296, 295.

⁵⁰ Here Church is equal to the cult.

2. The following chapter in Samuel is among the most important texts in literature of all types. II Sam 7 is the occasion of the Nathan prophecy. The Nathan prophecy performs a number of functions. The first thing that it does is to lend symbolic sacral legitimacy to David's throne.⁵¹ The how and the why of David's ascension are given in the first clauses of v. 8. The "endorsement" of David's throne⁵² brings up the problem of the dating of this passage. The question must be asked: how much of this central passage is to be awarded to earlier traditions? Caird spends some time explaining the possibilities before accepting Pfeiffer's argument connected with messianic hope. This theory places the text as a late midrash.⁵³ However, Rad's more cautious position is preferable.

The narrative unit is...dominated by the motif, "thou art not to build me a house, but I will build a house for thee." Nevertheless the text of the Nathan prophecy shows that it too is a collection of different conceptions. In the oldest of these, which can still be seen in vss. 1-7, 11b, and 16, Jahweh's promise is directed to David only; but in a later one, all the interest is diverted to David's posterity. Thus, behind this latter tradition there obviously lies a later age's concern to extend the content of the Nathan prophecy to include "those who will come forth from thy loins." . . . The content of the prophecy . . . consisted in Jahweh's promise to "build a house for David," to establish his authority as king, and to offer him a father-son relationship: Jahweh will be father to the anointed, and the latter is to be a son to him. Thus in its original form the Nathan prophecy is something like a torso and nothing more. What we have before us is a later and very much expanded account, which cannot have

⁵¹Rad, op. cit., I, 40.

⁵²Ibid., I, 310.

⁵³Caird, op. cit., p. 864f.

reached its earliest version before the time of Solomon, although fragments of formulations of the oldest prophecy were incorporated into it.⁵⁴

In this brief outline, Rad describes the basic impact and context of this chapter. The motif is surely historic. The emphasis upon it can be attributed to a later time. The concept of dynasty has wide-ranging implications. Yahweh had worked until this time through individuals whom He had called one by one as they were needed. Israel's relationship to Yahweh had been through charismatic leaders, men inspired by Yahweh's Spirit to lead His people to safety and security. Yahweh had called these men to rescue a repentant Israel (from the time of the settlement on). This charismatic leadership had its limitations. It was not transferable by the recipient.⁵⁵ In the Nathan prophecy, Yahweh commits Himself to a sustained kingship, which was not yet assured, and to a dynasty, a peculiar means of succession. This suggests that Yahweh transfers His charismatic leadership to an institution and to the heirs of a particular house. This implies that Yahweh is able to transfer His presence to a new and different concept of Israel. The dynastic monarchy will not lose the favor of Yahweh, either, for He promises His presence despite iniquity (cf 7:14f).⁵⁶

⁵⁴Rad, op. cit. So also Noth, op. cit., p. 224.

⁵⁵Although Samuel appointed his sons, they did not have charisma, given of Yahweh, to lead. Saul was called to fill that gap.

⁵⁶This was not so with Saul.

The later prejudice is seen as embellishment and not fabrication. Although the concept of messianic hope becomes a central theological tenet late in the history of Israel, particularly in the Exile and Postexilic period, the birth of the concept is here in the blessing and promise to David's seed. The metamorphosis of the people of Israel had been completed. They were now in the land which was given to Abraham their father. Yahweh's presence had been there during each change. When Israel became a gathered people, at the time of the confederacy, new urges and problems confronted the people. Yahweh again adapted His response to maintain His closeness to the chosen people. The establishment of the Davidic line means a further adaptation by Yahweh to the direction of history. The external history was not yet prescribed. The internal history and its redeeming leadership was assured.

And David desired to build a house for the Lord. But this was not to be his to do. Hertzberg's contention that v. 13 is an addendum and that the intent of the original story is to say that Yahweh wants no permanent dwelling but rather will dwell in a dynasty is very attractive.⁵⁷ The Chronicler's theological interpretation of the refusal to David because he is a warrior and allowing the son, Solomon, a man of peace (shalom) is also a later interpretation. Perhaps from this context it is impossible to decipher the real intent of this interpolation. The house was, nevertheless, built.

⁵⁷Hertzberg, op. cit., p. 287.

3. The Temple passage completes the transition to Jerusalem.

In I Kings 6-8, the description of the temple and its dedication to Solomon is given. The first two chapters are interested in the building of the house of the Lord and its complementary edifices. The overwhelming amount of space and detail given over to the Temple (6:2-36; 7:13-51) as against the palace (7:1-12) suggests that the writer is more interested in the Temple and may likely have been a priest.⁵⁸

The Temple was Yahweh's dwelling place. This was symbolically the impact of moving the Ark to its final resting place in the Holy of Holies. Robert Dentan offers an interesting comparison of the Temple to a palace.

In order to understand the design of Solomon's Temple, one must realize that a temple in the ancient world was not a church but a dwelling place for a god. The King lived in a palace, magnificently adorned as a proper setting for his dignity as a ruler among the rulers of the earth! His god must also have a palace, suitable to his dignity as a ruler among the rulers of heaven. . . There was no room for worshippers within a temple, any more than there was room in the royal palace for large groups of ordinary citizens.⁵⁹

There is an interesting attitude in Dentan's description which one may call the "capitivity of deity." The King lived in a palace! Why, he must put his god up in a palace! Perhaps Dentan did not mean this sarcastically. The writer of these descriptions in Kings gives us something to ponder, though. The Temple took seven years to build.

⁵⁸J. Gray, I and II Kings. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), p. 149.

⁵⁹R. C. Dentan, I and II Kings, I and II Chronicles (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964), p. 21.

This was Yahweh's "palace." Solomon's palace took thirteen years to finish! (Cf. 7:1). So much more is said about the Temple because of its continued heritage in the Judeo-Christian history. Yet, this human arrogance, glanced at in Dentan, has occurred before in religious texts. Whatever, "the building of the Temple marks a definite development in Hebrew religion, involving the worship of a settled community as against that of a nomad people."⁶⁰

The construction of the temple was remembered with great reverence. Yet, the event which gave it its ultimate difference was its dedication. Solomon, the King, had built the Temple. He had maintained stability in the land. He had begun the dynasty, for it is with the heir that a dynasty begins. The political security was the fulfillment of Nathan's prophecy. Israel had achieved peace and prosperity in the person from David's loins. Only David's wish to build a house for God remained. It was done and it was Solomon who dedicated it.

There are a number of observations which need to be made on the act of dedication. First, it was Solomon who acted as chief priest. The transition begun in David and forbidden to Saul was completed in Solomon. There is no question here that he is not only the King but also the cultic leader as well. Second, Solomon was first and always King. This is to say that the priestly functions that he

⁶⁰N. H. Snaith, "The First and Second Books of Kings," in Interpreter's Bible, III, 54.

performs are not unnatural but are not those functions which have marked him for history. Third, the Ark was brought to its final resting spot in the Holy of Holies. The transfer from a nomadic faith to a settled faith was completed. Yahweh now had a permanent home. Further, this permanent home was not at a revered cultic site but at a "neutral" political site.⁶¹ Fourth, Yahweh is said to endorse this new cultic arrangement by immediately becoming present in "a cloud" (cf 8-10). This tradition may be influenced by the wandering texts like Ex 33:9ff and Ex 40:34ff.⁶² Fifth, the late embellishment of the Deuteronomic writer points out the desire to expand on the known tradition that Solomon and not David built the Temple. This explanation (8:14-21) is consonant with the attitude in II Sam 7. Sixth, the place for Solomon as intermediary between the people and Yahweh is reinforced throughout his dedicatory prayer (8:22ff) and in the following blessing of the people (8:54ff). And, seventh, the relationship of David and Yahweh and the Mosaic traditions are brought together. (Cf. 8:24ff, 8:51ff, 8:56ff). This attempt to make the theological history continuous is a significant step in the consolidation of the traditions in Israel. It is most probably a late activity wherein the Temple is remembered but perhaps not

⁶¹ Jerusalem was not really "neutral" except in terms of geography. Its Canaanite heritage and "melting-pot" history made it a constant threat to Hebrew purity.

⁶² Gray, op. cit., p. 195 supports this. Cf. also Ex. 14:19f.

present.⁶³

These observations indicate two premises. The first premise is that the cult becomes indistinguishable from the government. The second premise is that the favorable attitude toward the Temple and the linking of the Temple traditions with those of the Ark, the wandering, the kingship, and salvation history are in large part the responsibility of the compiler. We should expect (and we receive) little negative expression from these texts.

4. The lateness of the compilation of this Davidic and Solomonic texts is exuded by their largely uncritical endorsement of the monarchy. Some significant changes in the relationships of Church and State have taken place. In effect, the Church has been enfranchised. This may seem odd and according to expectations is. Israel had been defined in cultic fashion from the time of its calling forth either with Moses or, more cautiously, with Abraham. In these texts, despite the personal piety of David and Solomon, the arena turns largely political. Only in the Temple narrative is the cultic the

⁶³Cf. J. A. Montgomery, The Books of Kings. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951). "The chapter is very composite. An ancient citation is balanced by long prayers in Deuteronomistic style, while the historical sections have been extensively swollen with later accretions." p. 185. Gray supports both Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic edition. Gray, op. cit., pp. 210f. among other places. Snaith suggests that much of this material is Deuteronomic, Snaith, op. cit., pp. 80, 84, 86f.

prime determinant in the color scheme.

To be sure, one cannot say that Israel has forgotten her cultic roots. On the contrary, the great wealth of meaning that the cultic heritage brings to Israel cannot be overestimated. The rise and development of the political identity of the State is supported with divine promise of presence. What the early position on this endorsement was is at best sketchy. It was not negative, but certainly it was not as full-bloom as later writers make it. The transition from singular charismatic officials to the charismatic endowment of the office of King is a dramatic step. The stabilization and institutionalization of this charismatic presence of Yahweh in the continuing non-cultic activities of Israel is accompanied by the stabilization and institutionalization of the cult itself. This is done at the initiative of David and is instituted with the dedication of the Temple by Solomon. The possibilities for ambiguity in allegiance become greatly increased as State and Church become solidified in a modified theocracy with Yahweh as King and the King as nagid.

This last relationship gives double strength to the kingship. Not only is the office itself endorsed now by Yahweh's adaptation to the historical realities and demands of the people, he endorses a particular house by adopting a father-son relationship with each King. David and Solomon are "doubly" charismatic, then. First, they are charismatic by their office and then by virtue of the special relationship they have to Yahweh himself. This continued adaptation by Yahweh still focuses primarily on the allegiance of people to God.

As Solomon says, "Let your heart therefore be wholly true to the Lord our God, walking in his statutes and keeping his commandments, as at this day." (I K 8:61).

D. THE DIVIDED KINGDOM

1. The united Kingdom under David and Solomon was a tenuous marriage of two areas which, although from the same stock, had never been close. Even during David's time, the closing of the gap which the string of Canaanite city-states -- of which Jerusalem was the chief -- presented did not clear the tension between two groups. (Cf II Sam. 20:1-22). Prof. Dentan is correct in assessing a long history of tension and strangeness. About the two groups, he says,

Were they, as the Book of Joshua represents, two parts of a single great people who invaded Palestine at the same time and became separate only after the conquest, or were they, as many modern interpreters think, two originally quite separate groups, related to each other only in a general way, who entered the country at different periods, perhaps as much as two centuries apart, and only later united into a single great Israelite confederation? Whatever may be the answer to this question. . .it is certain that the sense of separateness was always a strong one.⁶⁴

The political unity which had been established by David (it must be remembered that he was King of Judah for seven years before he became King over all Israel), was truly strained by Solomon.

When Rehoboam came to Shechem to be installed King of Israel the leaders of Israel demanded a change of policy. They refused to submit any longer to the forced labor system by which Solomon had built palaces and temples. When the negotiations broke down,

⁶⁴Dentan, op. cit., p. 47.

both parties resorted to arms.⁶⁵

Solomon's practices were remarkably similar to those which Samuel forewarned in I Sam. 8:10ff.

Two important clues to the situation are to be seen in this comment by Snaith. First, Rehoboam had to go to Shechem to be crowned King of Israel. This concept of a dual monarchy (King of Israel and Judah) indicates that the two groups were not really united. The situation seems more like an awkward confederacy. The significant question is, why must Rehoboam go to Shechem? If Jerusalem is truly the new capital and a neutral site, then there is no need for Rehoboam to go to the ancient cultic site. The answer is pointed to in Dentan.

That the nation was in essence a kind of dual monarchy, with two capitals, is shown by the fact that Rehoboam, Solomon's son, had to go to Shechem, the chief religious and political rallying point of the northern tribes, to receive their allegiance after his accession to the throne.⁶⁶

The second clue is intuited from the first and substantiated by the bargaining the North tried to pursue. The coming of Rehoboam is considered a political event. Concessions are to be won in a political-religious arena. Two capitals present problems for the claim of one loyalty. The picture is made all the more obscure by the fact that both Jerusalem and Shechem were cultic as well as

⁶⁵ Snaith, op. cit., p. 113.

⁶⁶ Dentan, op. cit., p. 47. I would be more cautious with the use of the term allegiance than is Dentan.

political centers. The feeling, here, is not one of the religious supremacy of one side or the other, but the political supremacy of either side which is at stake.

The split in the Kingdom causes the reinstitution of the cultic centers in the North. This act, coupled with the accession of Jeroboam, enflamed the two areas and split them apart. The split was never healed. Residue of the problem may be seen in the relationship of Jews to Samaritans in Jesus' time. The negative evaluation of Rehoboam does not exclude Judean authorship.⁶⁷ But, the evaluation is obviously more secular than religious. (The Jeroboam passage in 12:25ff speaks of religious influence and a means of thwarting it. This is still not the systematic statement of Solomon's dedication speech.)⁶⁸

The Kingdom of Israel, now dependent wholly on itself, simply had to have a national sanctuary: it is therefore not even probable that the real motive for the founding of the two national sanctuaries was fear that pilgrims would otherwise go to Jerusalem...⁶⁹

This is a case of making certain that the newly floated Kingdom has the proper ballast at each point!

2. Elijah's contest with the prophets of Baal offers an insight into Yahweh's dialogue with Israel. Elijah is a prophet, an office which had been used keenly by Yahweh in the past and was to be

⁶⁷Gray, op. cit., p. 279.

⁶⁸Snaith, op. cit., p. 117.

⁶⁹Rad, op. cit., I, 58.

a chief instrument in his dealing with his people in the future. The King, Ahab, is in a predicament. He has a drought on his hands. His Kingdom was literally withering. Jezebel had persecuted the Yahweh prophets and had caused them to flee the land. Ahab was being helped by Obadiah, the King's chamberlain (I Kings 18:4ff). Elijah, upon appearing to Obadiah, asks the latter to bring Ahab to him. When the King appears before Elijah, he accuses the prophet of being a trouble-maker. Elijah's courage in remaining within grasp and then challenging Ahab's Baalistic priests to an encounter is a most interesting scene. The language Ahab uses on Elijah indicates that he feels the latter is a pollutant.⁷⁰ Ahab's retort, argumentum ad hominem,⁷¹ indicates a principle charge against the Kingship, "...you have forsaken the commandments of the Lord and have followed the Baals." (I K 18:18).

The confrontation between the priests of Baal and Elijah is dramatically one-sided. The antics of the Baal priests are derisively recorded. The absurd number of prophets who function for Baal are given first chance to petition their god to end the drought. The awing contrast between the horde of Baal prophets, who fail, and the one Yahweh prophet, who succeeds in ending the drought, is a means by which Yahweh is exalted even more over the status of the Baals. The magical cult activities of the Baals has no effect whatsoever.⁷²

⁷⁰ Gray, op. cit., p. 349.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Ibid., p. 350.

Elijah's mockery of Baal is cruelly efficient. The hired priests of Jezebel are made to look even more foolish in their idolatry. Elijah's satire in a nutshell is the raciest comment ever made on pagan mythology. Yahweh's victory with Baal leaves a clear message. Yahweh is the God of Israel. No other god has the power to do anything for Israel. Only Yahweh and devotion to Yahweh have the possibility of positive fruits for His people. Ahab's response is to acknowledge Yahweh's supremacy. This return to the faith is short-lived, however. Jezebel promptly routs Elijah from his victory and sends him running from her persecution (19:1ff).

It is obvious from this story that the King is controlled, rightly or wrongly, by his wife. Jezebel's religious fervor for Baal is not abhorrent to Ahab, nor to the people. Only the prophets of Yahweh, again called charismatics, are faithful. Obadiah fears for his life when Elijah asks him to bring Ahab to him. Yahwists were persecuted in Israel. The conclusion that Israel no longer saw herself defined by her theological heritage is obvious. Only when Israel and the King can be shown in a dramatic way that their very survival depends on Yahweh do they turn back to him, momentarily. Even though Yahweh has been able to adapt His presence and means of relating to His people, He is rejected. The Elijah story demonstrates how contemptuous Israel and her King really are. Even when the awesome power of Yahweh is decisively proven, the King and the people

are not sufficiently moved so that they truly change directions.

3. The revolt of Jehu and the overthrow of Omari represents the expulsion of a ruling house which revered Baal and its replacement by the proponents of Yahwism -- Jehu, a general in the army, is anointed by an emissary of Elisha. It is odd that Elisha does not do the anointing himself for he is recognized as the prophet. In fact, for being the spiritual leader of Yahwism, Elisha is not heard from again through the coup.⁷³

The narrative belongs to a practically contemporary document, coming from the school of the prophets, with full sub voce approval of the revolt and Jehu's bloody deeds. There is no hint of the blame that was later cast upon the usurper as in (10:29ff, Hos 14.)⁷⁴

Certainly the support of the school of prophets is indicative of the political exigencies of the time. Jehu's bloody method, in the end, suffers the same prophetic denunciation that Omri's dynasty did.⁷⁵ The revolt was, indeed, bloody and swift. Jehu's tenacious acts of violence quickly sweep aside the two Kings, Jehoram and Ahaziah. "Since the revolt was really directed against the continuing influence of Jezebel, there could be no rest until she also was destroyed."⁷⁶ Dentan's unfortunately accurate term is too true.

⁷³Montgomery, op. cit. , p. 302.

⁷⁴Gray, op. cit., p. 483.

⁷⁵Dentan, op. cit., p. 93

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 91.

Jezebel was destroyed. And, after her, the final remnants of the house of Ahab. Jehu's cruel sweep to power was the result of religious conviction.

However much we may believe his personal motives in leading the revolt to have been chiefly selfish and secular, there is no reason to doubt his genuine devotion to the sturdy old national creed of Israel and his antipathy to the debased and formless religion with which Ahab and Jezebel proposed to contaminate it.⁷⁷

Jehu secures his own succession by destroying the males of the house of Ahab⁷⁸ and theoretically the coup and its reverberations are done. The meaning of Jehu's victorious blood bath is more difficult to assess. Jehu acted as the Lord's anointed. He fulfilled the prophecies of Elijah. He rid Israel of the ugliness of Baalism, for a time. He reestablished Yahwism as Israel's true religion. And, he was a butcher. Dentan tries to see the meaning of these texts.

First of all, it needs to be emphasized that there can be no doubt that the right side won. Jehu himself is quite as ugly a figure as Jezebel, but the principles he stood for were, perhaps accidentally so far as he was concerned, the only principles which could endure. The religion which Jezebel represented had no backbone, no real understanding of either God or man, and was almost entirely deficient in morality. It had nothing to offer the world and bore no promise for the future. The ancient religion of Israel, on the other hand, was virile, profound in its view of God and of the weaknesses and possibilities of man, and had within it the germ of universal morality. For the Christian, of course, it is also seen to be a part of God's ongoing revelation of himself to the world, a treasure which needed at all

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 92.

⁷⁸Snaith, op. cit., p. 239.

costs, to be preserved. . .⁷⁹

4. Church (the Israel cult) and State are related in a strange way here. The faith has been subordinated to the State by the Kings. Israel is blamed for this because she has accepted this state of affairs. Sometimes, she has endorsed it. Men within Israel bargain and parry to achieve political sovereignty. The faith is called upon to support political moves. And the Kingdom is divided. The political entanglements of the Kings involve a "judicious" toleration of religious beliefs which eventually, under the direction of Jezebel, persecute prophets of Yahweh. Nothing is done to stop it.

Even to this point, Yahweh chooses to work through the political system by challenging the now-established Baal cult to a feast of fruits. The Mt. Carmel experience is really a test of identity for Israel. The faith which Israel had was misplaced. Even though they acted as political beings, their faith was (and is) the basis of their being. A faith in Baal is a false and fruitless belief. Elijah "proves" the power of Yahweh. And Israel believes, for a moment. The net result is that the proponents of the faith revolt against the State. In effect, they say that allegiance is to Yahweh and not to

⁷⁹Dentan, op. cit., p. 93. I feel a great uneasiness with this statement. Yahweh was not completely "dead" in Israel nor in Judah. Jehu's revolt worked and he was working on the side which promoted right doctrine. This I believe. Yet, I prefer to leave this episode open, a mystery of sound religion creating unbelievable violence against a terrible evil. "They have rejected me as King. . ."

Baal. They do not go the extra step to say that allegiance is not to politics or political philosophy. The evaluation in the Jehu revolt that this is basically a religious struggle is sharp and in focus. Yahweh still works through charismatics who can work within or without the structures of society.

5. A further significant example of the conflict of faith and the political structure occurs in I K 21, the story of Naboth's vineyard. Naboth, a free man has a small vineyard that adjoins the king's property. The king wants the vineyard for a vegetable garden and offers to buy or trade for the land. His offer appears just and perhaps even generous.⁸⁰ Naboth's refusal is grounded in a theological principle that nears the central core of Israel's constitutionality. Snaith suggests,

This vineyard was Naboth's inheritance from his fathers, the hereditary property of his family. It did not therefore belong to Naboth, but to his whole family, past and yet to be born. He was perfectly within his rights in refusing to part with the property.⁸¹

Snaith stops short of the full meaning of Naboth's refusal. His last statement implies that Naboth could rightly sell the property. Anderson takes the further, and necessary step.

His refusal -- 'Yahweh forbid that I should give you the inheritance of my fathers' -- revealed an attitude toward land that was

⁸⁰ Cf. W. K. L. Clarke, Concise Bible Commentary (New York: Macmillan, 1953), p. 436. Also, B. W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1957), p. 212.

⁸¹ Snaith, op. cit., p. 172f.

unique with Israel. According to this view, Yahweh himself was the owner of the land. Faithful to his promise, he had brought the Israelites into a cultured country and had given the land to various tribes and clans. They were to act as stewards of Yahweh's property, administering it for the welfare of the whole community.⁸²

Anderson's comment implies that Naboth could do nothing else. He was bound by the peculiar cultic history which defined not only Israel but himself. The land was a sacred trust over which he had responsibility. His refusal of Ahab's offer was the only correct response. Ahab understands the prime claim of Yahweh's covenant relationship with Israel. Ahab does not seem to want to respond to Naboth's reason but only to his negative response. Ahab is so desirous of the land that he is able to look past the cultic claim to see Jezebel's plan. The first suggestion is probably not correct. Snaith points out, "Ahab himself seems to have realized that there was nothing further he could do about it. . ." ⁸³ Ahab is countering a basic premise of Israelite cultic heritage. Ahab accepts Jezebel's plot to take Naboth's vineyard by falsely accusing him of blasphemy and treason. The land of condemned criminals devolved to the King.⁸⁴ Ahab's acceptance of Jezebel's plan put him in conflict with Yahweh's covenant. ". . .The point at issue is the unconditional validity of God's law, before which all men are equal, and to which even a

⁸² Anderson, op. cit.

⁸³ Snaith, op. cit., p. 173.

⁸⁴ Noth, op. cit., p. 214.

king is subject." ⁸⁵ Ahab is held responsible for this breach (21:20). Elijah's statement is delivered to Ahab and not to Jezebel who shaped the deed. At this point, Noth's observation implies the proper relationship of the King and queen. "The despotic impulses of King Ahab were. . .attributed to the influence of the foreign queen. It again became clear that the monarchy was bound to follow 'secular' laws of its own. . ." ⁸⁶ Ahab was willing to accept the "pretense of legality" ⁸⁷ of the affair in order to acquire the vineyard. Elijah's confrontation with Ahab makes clear the relationship of Yahweh to the political entity, Israel. Ahab is the responsible officer of the State. Any bad influence or corruption that occurs which he does not purge is his responsibility. The acquiescence of the elders, who still had judicial authority (21:11ff), came back to Ahab.

Ahab's sin is twofold, then. First, he is guilty for ignoring the prime claim of the relationship of Yahweh to each person of Israel. Second, he accepts the criminal acts which were perpetrated on his behalf by the queen. "Elijah was surely correct in denouncing a double crime." ⁸⁸

In the previous encounters the basic encounter was between

⁸⁵ Rad, op. cit., II, 22f.

⁸⁶ Noth, op. cit., pp. 242f.

⁸⁷ Anderson, op. cit.

⁸⁸ J. M. Ward, "Naboth," in Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, III, p. .

Yahweh and a disobedient Israel, seen in the person of the king. Here a different level of encounter is exposed. Ahab allows the "secular" law of Israel and the "secular" power of his office militate against acceptance of his own cultic heritage. There is enough distance, in his own eyes, for Ahab to accept one judicial code over another. Elijah's message is very clear: The secular system is subordinate to the cultic. Despite the "accepted" legality of the false witnesses, the secular legal system still must not challenge the theological covenant which bound man to land and man to Yahweh. Ahab's basic crime here is the refutation of each man's responsibility to and right of a relationship to Yahweh.

The rejection of Yahweh's basic covenant relationship with his people by Ahab results in his rejection by Yahweh. Ahab's whole house will be destroyed, including Jezebel (21:21ff). This harsh rejection by Yahweh is met with true repentance on Ahab's part. We have no reason to doubt Ahab's honesty at this point.⁸⁹ Elijah receives an audition which tells of a reduction of the sentence which Yahweh had meted him. Certainly this is not meant as a complete acceptance of the criminal deeds but rather an adjustment by Yahweh to the repentance shown by Ahab.

The model of Church-State relationships is strong here. Elijah affirms the primacy of the cultic heritage and relationships of

⁸⁹ Snaith, op. cit., p. 178.

Israel to Yahweh.⁹⁰ The secular office does not have dominion over the cultic rights and responsibilities of the people. Israel is defined as the people of Yahweh and not as a nation-political entity. No final rejection of the State is made here. However, the "secular" activities of Israel must not conflict with the constitutional principles of Israel which are based upon Yahweh's covenant with his people.

E. AMOS

The confrontation between Amaziah and Amos at Bethel in Amos 7:10-17 issues in a significant prophetic exclamation by Amos. The confrontation is all the more interesting because it pits Yahwist against Yahwist. Amaziah is probably the high-priest of the Temple at Bethel, a major cult site.⁹¹ The event must have been crucial for Amos and is remarkably well informed.

The occasion must have been a crisis in Amos' career and may have marked the end of his activity, at least at Bethel. But what happened as a sequel to the encounter is unknown. . . the quotations from Amaziah and Amos are direct and the report is well informed. Amos is placed at Bethel. There is a separated remark of Amaziah that the land could not bear all of Amos' sayings implies that the prophet's activity had already extended over a period longer than a few days. The Priest is acquainted with Amos and knows he is a Judean.⁹²

⁹⁰ The Church, as used here, is to be understood as the cult and the cultic tradition.

⁹¹ W. R. Harper, Amos and Hosea, p. 169.

⁹² J. L. Mays, Amos. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), p. 134.

Amaziah's function of priest in a Yahweh temple creates some confusion as to why Amos confronted him.

We can therefore be sure that Yahweh was officially worshipped at Bethel, even if the form of cultus which was practiced there was far from satisfying the stricter prophets of Yahweh. For prophets of the type of Amos and Hosea it was only a disguised form of Baal cult.⁹³

Prof. Harper sees the conflict more accurately. "But from the beginning the prophet had antagonized the priestly order. The interests of the priest were identical with those of the King."⁹⁴

Hammershaimb's logic is difficult to follow, if, indeed, Amaziah is a Yahweh Priest. And, if he is also correct in assuming that he was chief priest at a Yahweh cult center, then how does he suggest that Amos was able to "see" this as a Baal cult. It seems far more likely that Amos would see that the priest shuns his true vocation, the exercising of true Yahweh worship. There is considerable distance between a lax Yahwist and a committed Baalist. Seeing the King's interests as his own marks Amaziah as a political figure. He is not political in the sense that sees his job as a political functionary. But, rather, his security is tied up with his political astuteness.

Amos reacts to Amaziah in three distinctive words. In difficult v. 14 of Am 7:10-17, Amos claims that he was not a prophet, that he viewed himself (before) as a herdsman. It is most probable that

⁹³ E. Hammershaimb, The Book of Amos (New York: Schocken, 1970), p. 114.

⁹⁴ Harper, op. cit.

Amos speaks here in the past tense. He also, most probably, speaks favorably of the nabi.

What is known of Amos from the undoubtedly authentic material in the book adds up. . .to a total picture which is connected with other men who were called nabi. Amos received visions and reported these experiences in terms and patterns typical of other prophets. His intercessions (7:2, 5), are a characteristically prophetic function. He was called and sent by Yahweh to Israel (7:15).⁹⁵

Amos fulfilled an ancient charismatic office -- an old device used by Yahweh to speak his will.

The opening section of his prophetic speech implies that Amos' authority is from Yahweh. Yahweh called him. Yahweh commissioned him. And, now, Amaziah tried to stop him from prophesying what he has been told to say. Despite what Amaziah might like to hear, he, in the knowledge of his office, should know enough to understand Amos' position. If, indeed, Amaziah feels that Amos is wrong, he should relate it on proper grounds. Amaziah knows only that Amos is disturbing the people and that it must stop. This is no authoritative challenge to Amos.⁹⁶

The third word is the prophetic announcement itself. It is in the standard form of an oracle of judgment.⁹⁷ The antithesis made between what Amaziah said to Amos and the word of Yahweh is clearly marked.⁹⁸ What Amaziah wants Amos to do is exactly the opposite

⁹⁵ Mays, op. cit., p. 138. Cf 137f.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Harper, op. cit., p. 172.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

of the commission given to the prophet by Yahweh. The pronouncement of doom, captivity in a foreign land, the death of his (Amaziah's) children, and the rape of his wife, is in reaction to his attempt to thwart the prophet.

Amaziah is guilty of having contradicted the command of Yahweh to Amos. The messenger of a King who came bearing the King's own word was an extension of the royal person; Amaziah has pitted his order against the very will of Yahweh in presuming to exercise authority over his messenger. In doing so the priest stands in a company of others who have opposed prophets raised up by Yahweh and so added to the guilt of Israel.⁹⁹

The guilt which Amaziah is convicted of is twofold. There is the explicit guilt of trying to thwart the functioning of a prophet of Yahweh. Amaziah's punishment is the same as the country will suffer. There is also an implicit guilt of not realizing the true foundations of his office and acting from the deepest source with a fear of the King and not of Yahweh. Amos is straightforward. Amaziah and the system which he supports and that supports him will be destroyed.

2. The transition that the people have made away from Yahweh is more profound than ever. Not only has the nation become so involved with politics that it is no longer a nation of Yahweh, the official priests (and presumably the whole entourage of cult functionaries) are no longer to be trusted. These cult officials have sold out to the present power of the political lenders. They are not

⁹⁹ Mays, op. cit., p. 140.

any longer able to hear the word of Yahweh and accept it. They, too, like the people, cannot bear to hear what Amos speaks. The one whom they rejected is now compelled to action. The nation will be destroyed. The people will be taken from the land promised to their fathers. They have given up their heritage. Now they will forfeit the right to the fruits of the faith. Their loyalty to the State has escalated into allegiance. They believe that the State has ultimate authority and power over them. A rejected Yahweh, through his messenger, Amos, speaks with a different voice. Israel is doomed.

F. JEREMIAH

1. The final passage to be discussed is the temple speech in Jer. 7. The temple speech, along with Baruch's recording of Jeremiah's capture, trial, sentencing, and deliverance, form the completion of the circle of the rejection of Yahweh by His people. Kuist points at the central problem when he says,

The essence of Jeremiah's Temple Sermon is simply this: a faith which divorces the worship of God from one's obligations to people is no real faith.¹⁰⁰

Certainly, Kuist reflects here one of the central themes of Jeremiah's prophecy. This doesn't fully disclose the problem.

Habel sees the problem in another light, which is also helpful.

¹⁰⁰ H. T. Kuist, The Book of Jeremiah (Richmond: John Knox Press,)

. . .The people had succumbed to the perennial disease of religious smugness, self-satisfaction, and self-righteousness. The imposing presence of the temple, which bore the very name of Yahweh Himself, was considered an unconditional guarantee of God's presence, protection, and good pleasure.¹⁰¹

The accepted tradition that the Temple was Yahweh's dwelling, his permanent home, reinforced this smugness.¹⁰² But, nevertheless, this still only skirts the problem.

The smugness and the idolatrization of the Temple is only part of Jeremiah's accusation. In 7:8ff, Jeremiah cites the crimes against Yahweh that the people have committed. The offenses "listed are violations of the eight, sixth, seventh, ninth, first and second commandments, i.e., constitute an almost total breach of the covenant stipulations."¹⁰³ The people have committed the crimes and they acknowledge them. Yet the people cannot understand nor can they accept Jeremiah's rejection of them. The people have done what they thought was correct. In fact, they have all the positive cultic arguments on their side. They have sinned, sinned greatly. They come into the Temple and honestly and fervently pray for Yahweh's repentance. They come with full conviction to repent. Their prayer is earnest. The problem lies in the disconnection of religious faith from the daily life that the people lead. Faith, for them, is an honest and sincere

¹⁰¹ N. C. Habel, Jeremiah, Lamentations (St. Louis: Concordia, 1968), pp. 90f.

¹⁰² J. Bright, Jeremiah (Garden City: Doubleday, 1965), p. 55.

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 56.

effort to right a skewed relationship by acts of repentance at peculiar times set aside for that kind of activity. Here, Jeremiah says, even relying on the efficacy of the Temple will no longer hold. In essence, the people of God have been using God against God. Yahweh condemns them for transgression. He has also provided them with a means of repentance so that they may escape doom. The cyclical nature of their lives unveils the real effect of their actions: God is used to placate God. What is more, the people do this with full cultic integrity. Yahweh himself has ordained these methods of expiation. They are not the fabric of man's hand. The religious importance and seriousness of each act has failed to change their behavior. What was once a means of expiating unbearable guilt has now become a cultic means of avoiding responsibility during the periods between acts of repentance. Kuist hints at it. Habel senses the people's viewpoint.

What Jeremiah does is genuinely shocking to everyone. He prophesies the end of the Temple. Yahweh will no longer abide by his own scheme. He will create another scheme whereby his people can and will be faithful to him not only in times of repentance, but in all times and in all places. This proclamation, the people believe, is highly blasphemous. The prophet, in substantiating his word, reminds them of the fate of Shiloh which lay less than twenty miles from Jerusalem. It is easy to see that Josiah's reforms have

not truly changed the people.¹⁰⁴ Jeremiah's frontal attack on their self-deceit is more than the people can bear. Jeremiah is arrested.

Jeremiah's trial is an interesting and sad affair. Jeremiah's crime is capital. "A threat such as pronounced against the Lord's house by this man is blasphemy, a mortal crime! (Cf. Ex. 20:7; Lev. 24:16; Acts 6:11-14)."¹⁰⁵ Even in this mortal confrontation, Jeremiah speaks only what he has been told. If only Judah would repent and amend her ways, Yahweh would repent of the evil Jeremiah prophesied. If they persist, their fate is sure. Surely, this is one of the most remarkable speeches ever made. To a group which has calcified their very means of repenting, God, through his prophet, says that he will overlook this final indecency if only Israel would repent and amend her ways. But Israel has chosen her path and it will not be altered.

In Jeremiah's defense, some of the elders recount their recollection of the confrontation between Micah and Hezekiah. The elders present an even and persuasive case.

Impressed by this recall of past experience which dealt with the courageous prophetic teaching of Micah uttered at peril to his life, and no doubt also moved by the straightforwardness and quiet courage of Jeremiah, the nobles and the people arrived at a decision.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴E. A. Leslie, Jeremiah (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954). This speech is seen in the early years of Jehoiakim's reign, p. 113. T. Laetsch, Bible Commentary, Jeremiah (St. Louis: Concordia, 1952). Sees this at the end of Josiah's reign, pp. 93f. The former evaluation is to be preferred.

¹⁰⁵Laetsch, op. cit., p. 219.

¹⁰⁶Leslie, op. cit., p. 119.

Jeremiah would not die because he had the courage to speak God's word. Jeremiah is protected by Ahikam, son of Shaphan, a man of influence. But the prophecy stood firm.

2. The Temple speech completes the full circuit of Yahweh's adaptation to the historical contexts in which man found himself. Beginning with pure theocracy, Yahweh has adapted to each circumstance until at last He is forced to again require theocracy. Israel had, by this time, separated herself into two distinguishable entities: Israel -- the political state and Israel -- the cult. This separation did not occur all at once. However, in Jeremiah's time the separation was clear enough. Israel would never define herself exclusive of her religious heritage. Nevertheless, a separation of function and authority was easily apparent. The two entities were still overtly attached enough to see the recording of a prophet's confrontation of the King. Surely the King's deference to Elijah is far more than a "White House religious image." The acceptance of the acts of repentance indicate a belief in the efficacy of these rites of expiation. Here the problem comes into focus.

Yahweh established the covenant with Israel. Israel accepted. Yahweh claimed the allegiance of all men of Israel. Israel acknowledged that allegiance. The nature of the relationship made it difficult if not impossible for Israel to fulfill the requirements of the covenant. Expiation from sins was a necessary ingredient for the covenant relationship. This covenant relationship demanded a total commitment by Israel. Guilt and repentance were deep, personal

affirmations of a need of Yahweh. Acts of repentance had become almost mechanical. Response to the claim of Yahweh had been separated to "appropriate" times and places. The reality of cultic claims and daily life did not mix. Faith was important -- in its proper setting. Israel is certainly in earnest in her life style. She is, however, not congruent with the demands of Yahweh upon her.

Yahweh's rejection is total and devastating. If Israel, by her own self-deceit, can use God's rules against God and God's institutions against God, then God must change the rules and institutions for His own purposes. No longer will the rituals of expiation be acceptable with a total commitment to faith. No longer will the Temple be an efficacious symbol for it will be destroyed. The rites and symbols have become idols which have obscured the true nature of the covenant relationship. Yahweh will institute a new theocratic relationship which each man will have "written on his heart." Man's capacity to deviate from Yahweh's claim by errant use of symbols, rites, and doctrine can only result in a rejection of those idols, the destruction of dependence upon them, and a reinstitution of a proper relationship with Yahweh.¹⁰⁷

G. MODELS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT

It would be helpful here to discern the types of models of

¹⁰⁷ This reinstitution does not mean that symbols, rites, and doctrine will no longer be employed, but, rather that they must be derivative of a new constitutive event.

Church-State relationships that are promoted in these Old Testament texts. Our purpose here is to briefly outline the contours of the various models of Church-State relationships. Their usefulness and their adaptability in peculiar settings of allegiance is the province of the third chapter of this essay.

The first model to be discerned is the pure theocracy pointed to in Gideon. Israel at this time is almost exclusively a cultic community. Yahweh is her King and Lord. Issues and problems which arise are evaluated only in terms of their theological-cultic significance. As a method of reformation and preservation, Yahweh raises up charismatic leaders who save Israel from danger and defeat. The concept of history, in this shorter context, is cyclical: Israel is responsive to Yahweh; she wanders and is corrupted (willingly) by her pagan neighbors; Israel suffers accordingly; finally, she repents earnestly to Yahweh who raises up a deliverer from her midst. The message is clear. Yahweh and Israel are held together by an exclusive bond. Yahweh is Israel's only God. Israel is Yahweh's people. There are no political or geographical contours of great importance here, except that one might note that Israel -- the land -- is a gift which was promised to the ancestor Abraham.¹⁰⁸

A second model is theocracy with the establishment of political office. This significant change is noted in the Saul narrative.

¹⁰⁸ Geographical considerations would entail national boundaries and disputes over them, whether this be defense of them or expansion of them (such as Ahab and David).

Saul's office, although not dynastic, is a shift from the purely cultic to a mere socio-political one. To be sure, Israel still views herself primarily as Yahweh's people but the contours of national identity are present here. Yahweh is still Lord and the only One to whom allegiance is given. Saul's primary function is to act as a unifying agent and deliverer of Yahweh's salvation. The office is political in that it corresponds to the heads of state of other nations. This similarity should not be underestimated. Israel no longer defined herself solely on cultic grounds. Israel's interface with her neighbors called for an historical response to a peculiar historical context. Hence, this is theocracy focused through an established office.

A third model which was established was the Church-State alignment. Here, especially in David and Solomon's time, the Cult and the State have overlapping functions. Solomon dedicates the Temple. Nathan advises David and chastises him as well. Israel has developed two separating identities. Israel -- the religious entity becomes increasingly involved with rites and sacrifice. Israel -- the political entity becomes increasingly involved with war, security, productivity, alliance, and so forth. With Solomon, there is the permanent dynastic office which is not only political (King) but theological ("son"). Establishing Jerusalem as the cult center as well as the political center is no accident. The possibilities for ambiguity in allegiance are soon here. The personalities of David and Solomon were such that the records are favorably impressed with the fusion of these dipolar entities in the one office.

Some modifications are made in this particular model. The Kingship is seen as an ever increasing political function. In Elijah, there is a prophetic challenge to this self-understanding. Allegiance through the Church-State is still assumed. However, charismatic challenge to this model is provided as the King relies more on "other religious viewpoints" and on the political perspective of his office. Elijah acts as a reminder that the King is still a Yahweh functionary. Ahab's recognition of this is evidence of this corrected self-understanding. Elijah acts here as an accepted cultic functionary who suffers because of his cultic affiliation.

A second modification of the Church-State model is the rejection of cultic deference to the political. The yielding of "cultic" responsibility to the political is the chief crime that Amos expounds. Amaziah supports the State without theological distance. The priest is no longer able to respond constructively to the movement of the King. Amos is called from within the Israelite community to speak to the cultic functionary reminding him of his calling and responsibility. This modification shows that although allegiance is still able to be focused through the Church-State, even the cultic functionaries are corruptible in the shadow of political power. A total rejection of the Church-State is not made here. Rather, as the political separates itself from the theological basis of its genesis, the cult-Church must be careful to avoid defining itself as subordinate to the State. Although the political side of the Church-State appears to be more powerful, the cult-Church must remember that its power is

derived from devotion to Yahweh. The tension between "worldly" or "political" solutions and "theological" or "faith" responses is focused all the more clearly here.

The fourth model to be discerned is the I-Thou relationship of allegiance seen in Jeremiah. Here the corruptibility of the State institution and the Church institution has become so thorough that both must be rejected. Along with this rejection of the historical institutions are the corresponding historical rubrics. What is called for in Jeremiah is an immediate relationship between God and man. The institutions have become so corrupt that they must be rejected as useful historical vehicles of Yahweh's presence in Israel and the world. It is highly significant that an historical (institutional) relationship is clearly severed by an existential framework which depends on the former's rejection. Even more significant is the implication that this existential experience precedes and precipitates a new historical (institutional) relationship.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁹ One need only refer to the beginnings of Methodism or Lutheranism or the story of Israel to see the relationship of existential experience and historical institution. Reform as well as new beginnings are possible in this framework.

CHAPTER III

CONCLUSIONS CONCERNING A THEOLOGY OF ALLEGIANCE

IN CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate some strikingly similar conclusions which are drawn from the systematic statement in chapter one and the exegetical statements of chapter two. This chapter is not to be misconstrued as a full-blown hermeneutical discussion of the problem of allegiance. Further, it must be recognized that there is a danger in equating the cult in the Old Testament with the Church in our world. Certainly, a simple equation is not intended. The attitude of caution which pervades the earlier chapters, however, suggest that the treacherous possibilities must be embraced for the sake of the apparent usefulness of the comparison. No hermeneutical method is here endorsed. The obvious similarities between Israel's position and ours must be acknowledged despite the concurrent opacity of system. With this important caution in mind, let us proceed to the conclusions which can and should be drawn from these chapters.

A. ALLEGIANCE IN CONTEXT

1. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the results of the first two chapters in the hope that some definitive parameters of allegiance may be drawn for the Christian. The first chapter dealt with the nature of allegiance. The second dealt with analyses of texts where the interface of cult and State were seen. Here we should like to see if the attributes of allegiance in the first chapter were present in the constructs of the texts, and, if so, how were those constructs related to the peculiar perspective of each text.

It will be necessary for us to review some critical elements in allegiance relationships. First, the religious nature of allegiance, the notion of creed, and the role of institutions will be briefly re-examined. Then, from the particular perspective of the Christian, two areas need to be sketched briefly: the Christ-man relationship and the Christ-Church relationship. Then, it will be possible to examine each text from the Old Testament so that any pertinence from their messages may be gleaned. Let us move to the elements of allegiance relationships.

2. Allegiance is a religious activity, By this is meant that allegiance requires belief, devotion, and commitment. Belief is held in the central idea of the object of allegiance. This central idea

forms the constitutional basis upon which the devotees align themselves. Although the central idea may be highly developed and wholistic in scope and matrix, it may be accepted at very elementary levels. Hence, Thomistic theology may be elaborated to an infinite degree, yet, the parishioner may only intuit the larger contours of the system. This suggests two things. One, the central idea must have intrinsic value which is worthy of study. Without this intrinsic value, there is no lasting basis for the promulgation of the idea. The idea must continue to be "true" or congruent with human experience or it will fade. Two, only the most basic precepts of this truth, however, influenced by the subtleties of devoted inquiry, are necessary to establish the claim on people. The Christian faith, then, can and must have its subtleties and dialogue of ideas which are based upon the intrinsic worth of the Christ event. However, that the Christ event is alive and primal to man's lives ("true") is sufficient for its claim upon them. This does not mean that the deliberations of clerics and scholars are irrelevant or futile. Their work is to create a fluid ethos which will allow a permeation of thought patterns and emphasis which clothe the central idea to match the historical context. The laity (whether theological or political--or whatever!) respond to these secondary ideas by the pressure of their historical perspective and the congruency of those ideas with their experience as claimed ones.

Devotion is most often witnessed as meditation or worship. In meditation or worship, symbols form an important part of structuring.

The clear generic relationship between symbol and idea is often blurred by history or context. Nevertheless, symbols retain a sufficient modicum of idea reinforcement to be efficacious. Although most symbols are normally understood to be physical characters, the creeds are to be included as verbal symbols.¹ Creeds are simply statements of belief. Giving allegiance is acknowledging a claim upon oneself. A creed can be a verbal acknowledgement of that claim or a recounting of the context of that claim. Pledges of allegiance, acts of devotion which center on a verbal symbol, or systematic statements are all creedal activities. Acts of allegiance very often are keyed to creeds, verbal symbols, which undeniably involve the participants in the devotional act. These are acts of commitment.

The context in which these devotional acts take place are largely institutions. Institutions which last are those which establish sufficient social mass and which are able to perpetuate the central idea by replenishing itself. Institutions can never fully and accurately reflect the central idea. The purpose of an institution is to approximate the central idea. Technically, one holds allegiance to the idea through the institution. In that light, one can never hold allegiance to the idea of institution which can approximate the idea for which it was established. (This need not be so, though.) The institution is the historical matrix which the devotees are able to react

¹

D. T. Kauffman, The Dictionary of Religious Terms (Westwood, N. J.: Revell, 1967), p. 405.

to each other and to the common central idea. Commitment is an institutional rubric. It is enacted, reinforced, interpreted, and proclaimed in the context of the institution. Without the institution, commitment becomes a meaningless relational category. Thus, allegiance is a religious activity witnessed by acts of devotion which are symbols of ultimate commitment historically discerned in the institution.

3. A Christian's allegiance is a religious activity witnessed to by worship wherein some form of creedal statement (and other symbolic acts) acknowledge his ultimate commitment to Christ (as the focal and prime image of meaningful existence and possibility before God) as He is discerned in the Body of believers, the Church. Christ ultimately points beyond Himself to God the Father. Men can witness the presence of God through the Christ event. It is God's claim upon us that we acknowledge. Christ makes clear that claim and frees us to respond to it with hope. Man has faith in Christ and more particularly in the Christ event. This faith in the record is precipitated by a crucial experience of love which, symbolized by the cross, becomes one image of the central idea to which we give our acknowledged allegiance. Man responds through Christ to the meaning and structure of existence which is defined in God's being. Man, Christian man, professes faith in an historical event and in a present experience. This is different from professing an idea in a philosophical sense.

These committed Christians band together in the Church which acts as medium of corporate expression of faith but, also, as a

receptacle of revelation. The meaning and concept of the Christ event is not yet finalized. Hence, the Christians profession of faith is at the same time challenged by the present Christ to adapt the historical context which is in flux. The church is peculiarly related to Christ in that it is His body. This gives to the Church intrinsic value. The Church given assurance that Christ's Spirit will remain among us. Few other institutions have that promise. Nevertheless, the institutional Church is not the whole Church and neither is it to be equated with Christ. Despite His assurance, then, the Church has the possibility and the probability of altering the generic claim of God through Christ upon us. His promise leads us to believe that the Church will survive aberration and heresy. Thus, albeit the Church, as historic institutions, suffer from human weakness, we are yet bold to believe, in its continuing efficacy. Yet, as suggested above, we do not hold allegiance in the Church insofar as it is an historical entity. We can proclaim our allegiance to Christ's Church as His Body. Here the institution is not only the matrix of the central idea but its manifestation as well.

B. THE OLD TESTAMENT MODELS INTERPRETED

1. The model that we see in the Gideon texts is theocracy. Yahweh rules His people. There is no sovereign being between Him and His people. Gideon is a called Charismatic leader. The "judge" receives his calling in a particular time with the function of dealing with a singular set of circumstances. At this time in her history, Israel has little or no political consciousness. Gideon is understood

by the community to be a charismatic. His primary function is to lead a repentent Israel back to Yahweh. The cyclical history is an important Key. Israel's history is seen in terms of her relationship to Yahweh, no more no less. The state of those affairs suggest a cultic self-understanding. Here, even the priesthood is not the bearer of the sharisma. The concentration on land security is not to be seen as a political activity. Gideon was called to protect the "promised" land. This is a religious heritage already centuries old.

The request made of Gideon to be King over Israel is probably not a largely political request. The request is probably contextual. Kings served as seemingly stable rulers in neighboring nations. The Kingship was a recognized office. The office of "judge" was an insecure possibility of leadership from Israel's eyes. Gideon's statement that Yahweh is King suggests that Israel's stability lies in her covenant with Yahweh. The people's request of Gideon is unwittingly political in that her request of apparent social stability is a request for an institution that in and of itself moves toward socio-political stabilization. Gideon's refusal is two-pronged. The basic motivation for the request is insecurity. Gideon states that Israel has her security in the kingship of Yahweh. The seeming insecurity of their situation is illusory. The second prong of Gideon's refusal is the latent political basis of the request. Israel, although not consciously, is asking a political question. Gideon sees the road that this step presents. The textual editor, hundreds of years later, reinforces that insight. Movement toward political consciousness was,

in the editor's eyes, totally destructive of the covenant relationship of Yahweh and Israel. One final implication in this text is that the proper relationship is tied to the ongoing strength of the cult.

Israel's sorrows are the result of abandoning the covenant requirements which are remembered through the cult. Israel remains defined as the community of the faithful. A political definition of Israel is unacceptable. The institution which embodies the faithful is the cult.

A few conclusions may be drawn from this text. Allegiance is exclusivistic. The solely political is an unnecessary category of interaction for Israel. Theocracy is the cultic community in isolation from or separation from other communities. This is real separation of Church-State and Secular-State. The cult and the religious ethos is wholly different from the State by self-definition. Problems are seen as acts of God through which the covenant community can be purified. Allegiance is surely a religious category. Israel must repent and go through the symbolic acts of penance. Then, a leader is brought up in their midst to stabilize the life situation. The acts of repentance are reinforcing acts of the claim of Yahweh on His people. These acts become creedal in that they are symbolic both physically and verbally. The self-defining of the community of the faithful precludes meaningful relationship with the surrounding communities. Indeed, the surrounding communities act only as instruments of God's will. There is no place for State-State or Church-State interface. The underlying fear of exposure and seduction by the "real" world causes the tradition to be isolationists. Several communities were

begun with similar motives in the United States. Two such communities were the Mormons and the Shakers. These isolationists did not acknowledge the legitimacy of "worldly" relations. Finally, Israel, as a cult, did not present two clear opponents which would bring about an encounter of Church and State in the same socio-economic-political area.

2. There is a shift in the Saul texts from the position seen in Gideon. Israel appears as a more homogeneous unit in the Saul Texts. Again, in these texts, Saul is called to deliver Israel. Why the office of King is established, is answered in two highly divergent ways. One way suggests that the people asked for this evil themselves, ignoring their true King, Yahweh. The other suggests that the Kingship is the product of divine revelation through the "seer," Samuel. If one accepts the positive explanation, Saul represents Yahweh. Even the negative approach does not deny the theological responsibility the new King carries. In fact, it is because Saul does not fulfill his task explicitly that he is thrown into disfavor.

The development of the kingship is an predictable expansion of Israel's social and cultural matrix. As the Hebrews became more settled, the office of King would become the normative position in a land which thrived with Kingships. There is still significant difference between our concept of Kingship and the concept employed in the ancient Near East and in Israel. The King was primarily and lastly related to the cult. His office and responsibility were derived from the god (in this case, Yahweh). His stature and reign were accounted for and to

the god (Yahweh). A purely political office is not imaginable in this particular case (nor in the ancient Near East). Israel was constitutionally Yahweh's chosen people. Any and all events were related to her through the eyes of the cult. Thus, the key role of Samuel is all the more striking.

This implies that although the predictable development of a cultural community would be to a solidification of identity and institution in a political manner, this is not true for Israel. The negative text concerned with the establishment of the Kingship also implies that there are dangers of rule and power which lie beyond the intention of King or people at the time of inauguration. A third implication is drawn from these two. Although Israel's development is not a politically conscious development, it is a move away from the purely cultic in the narrow sense employed before. And, this expansion of the cultic horizon into new arenas of experience bring with it new possibilities of power and its abuse, delineation of power and rule, and ambiguity in allegiance. That is, the cult ceases to be neatly defined as the worshipping community which confessed the same creed and was led by a sharply defined corps of functionaries. The establishment of a settled community and the interface of various cultures inevitably brings an expansion of cultural horizons. Israel had given up the possibility of existing solely as a cultic community and was thrust into a struggle with non-cultic as well as cultic problems.

A couple of conclusions are pertinent here. The first conclusion one might draw is this: The believer, if he ventures from the

"purely" cultic, as it was defined in the Judges text, finds himself in new territory, territory which is not wholly defined by his viewpoint. This new arena into which he brings the gifts of his faith also holds attractions which he intends to avoid. Yet, he may not avoid them. The faithful finds that these attractive nuances of "secular" life are tempting. This leads to the second conclusion. The cultic cannot remain isolationist. The believer is not able to withdraw from the world because he lives in it. Thus, one cannot avoid the question of Church and State. Further there is never really separation of Church and State because a man's faith is in competition with society's claim. It is only possible to limit the scope of each segment of society. This, as Saul and all later leaders discovered, is not easily done. Hence, if one takes seriously the claim of Jesus Christ, one must face the problem of allegiance, problems of ambiguity and hierarchy. This problem becomes more acute as the history of Israel moves on.

3. In the David and Solomon texts, the direction which began with Saul is furthered. Israel had by this time become an established people in the land. The decision to be actively a part of the surrounding ancient Near Eastern culture was made largely on geographic contingencies. Israel's acceptance of this new role thrust her faith into a new challenge. It was left to David and Solomon to consolidate this new expansion into a meaningful whole. The establishment of a new cult site as well as a new political capital in Jerusalem is highly significant. Prior to this time, Israel was basically a set-

this political activity is not loosed as yet. Fourth, the establishment of a single center for both nation and cult brings their relationship all the more into the light. By sheer proximity, they are unable to avoid each other. Finally, the establishment of the Ark in effect, makes Nation-State and cult-Church coincident. Here, the secular arena and the sacred arena are made to echo the same limits. At this point, contact between the two is inevitable.

From these implications we may draw the following conclusions. Allegiance may be claimed by a State-Church institution insofar as both have the same constitutional base. Here, Israel's self-understanding of her unique relationship to Yahweh is carried over to the unique relationship of Yahweh to the house of David. It is possible for Church and State to work productively in the same arena, particularly when the leader of the State is a chief functionary in the Church as well. The position of the regent in England is a taste of a previous relationship of this sort. The development of two established institutions of allegiance requires the people to develop a hierarchy of loyalties. Here allegiance is given Yahweh through both institutions. Yet, a significant relationship would be remembered. It was David, acting as King, who brought the Ark to Jerusalem. The cult did not press for this. The political structure, in the person of David, moved in that direction. This is most crucial. The political power is significant enough at this point to exert binding pressure on the cult. This was of course to continue. Allegiance in David's time is consolidated in Jerusalem.

tled nomadic cult. In the building of the temple, a permanent dwelling, Israel became an enfranchised cult. Enfranchised is meant to say given a favored place by the political establishment. This establishment, in the persons of David and Solomon had widely accepted political power. They also function within the cult. And, Solomon, at a crucial point, consecrates the Temple as priest and King. Nevertheless, they are seen and see themselves as Kings of Israel, ruling as adopted sons of Yahweh. The cult, which had been established as tradition sans locale, and the political institution cohabited the same place. David and Solomon both had "secular" as well as cultic responsibilities. Israel is defined in secular as well as sacred fashion. In both cases, Israel remains the chosen people.

There are several implications here that are significant for our study. One, the relationship of Church and State is that of a part. It appears that in the doubly charismatic Kings we see the symbolic heads of two kingdoms which overlap extensively. The two are not separated. The State does not define itself apart from the faith. The Church institution remains intertwined in many of the decisions. The record is pro-kingship on the grounds that David and Solomon were pious leaders. Two, the kings are not only leaders by their personalities and calling but by their office. Here, the same development takes place as had previously taken place in the cult. The office had become efficacious as an institution of mediation between Yahweh and people. Third, the growing political consciousness is not to be seen as an overt rejection of the cult. Rather, it is an expansion of concern to a new arena of common activity. The latent danger of

There remains, however, the tensions of dissatisfied but weak people outside the capital.

In Solomon's consecration of the Temple, we observe the King acting as a priest. Here an important but subtle change takes place. Solomon's act is made not as a priest alone but as a priest-King. The most crucial act in Israel's history in the promised land is presided over by a political--cultic functionary. This in and of itself is not too significant. In the context of the larger history, though, it is all important. The King becomes the key figure in Israel's history. The Kingship defines the course of history for the next couple of hundred years. The Kingship becomes increasingly political in nature. The subtle beginnings of ambiguity are to be discerned here. With Solomon, the wedding of Church and State becomes cemented. The corporate act of worship, led by the King reinforces allegiance. However, the object of allegiance, Yahweh, is seen in at least two imperfect views. The cult has remained an institution largely concerned with sacrifice and ritual. The State has assumed leadership for the welfare of her citizens. In doing so, she has also appropriated the goal and image of Israel the cult--the promised land. The question must be asked. Did Yahweh intend for the land to be for a chosen people or a chosen nation?

The charisma of office and the commonality of tradition have begun to create the possibility of confusion and ambiguity. Certainly the Christian is faced with the same situation when he lives in a "Christian" nation. Can he hold allegiance to the State as symbolic

representative of God? this text suggests that when the commonality of goal and purpose are congruent, one can have allegiance to the Church-State. This is to say that there are times when State and Church are in harmony and can claim allegiance. Because allegiance is exclusivistic, this claim will need to come from a single institutional form. Hence, a Church-State is necessary.

4. Elijah's reaction to the workings of the Kingship bring to light some real conflicts with the Church-State tradition which was begun with Solomon. In the first Elijah text, we see that the cult has been reduced in stature to the role of advisor. Even this role is shared by the prophets and priests of Baal. The nature of the State is to make its goals and preservation supreme. Elijah's challenge to the cult is not so much a text on Baalism as it is a text on Yahwism. Baal can do nothing for Israel because Yahweh is her God. The King is convinced of this and it appears that Israel can change course.

The implication of this is that the State has subordinated the Church. The Church has been reduced to an advisory capacity. Allegiance is now demanded by the State. The cult has fallen into disfavor with the King (and Queen). Elijah's reaction and challenge to the Baalists is a lashing back at State policy. Elijah tells the King that he has forgotten his roots--particularly where "State" affairs are concerned.

In the second Elijah text, a more fundamental challenge is leveled against the King. He has allowed covetousness to overcome the

basic covenant relationship between man and Yahweh. Yahweh had given the land to Naboth and his family. Naboth was not free to dispose of the property even if he wanted to. Ahab's desire overrides this sacred relationship. At this point, Elijah challenges the State. His prophecy of judgment is a cry for allegiance. Israel must remain true to her only ally, Yahweh. One can no longer hold allegiance to the corrupt State. The State is rejected as being a viable institution of allegiance for Israel. A challenge by the State of the fundamental relationship of man and Yahweh is not to be tolerated.

The conclusions we may draw are these: As the State increases in power and establishment, it will demand more and more of its citizens. In its position of power, it will try to order and arrange loyalties. The Christian must resist this easy flowing movement. The Church as the preserver of the Word must not be subordinated to the State. The Church, if it remains true to its constitutionality demands our allegiance. All other claims must be seen in that light. In other words, the unique relationship that we, as members of Christ's Body have to Christ and God the Father is not to be bypassed or subordinated in any fashion. The State can only be affirmed when and where it is congruent with the Church's constitutionality.

5. When the cult was forced into a subordinate role in Israel a crucial decision had to be made. The decision, as the cultic officials saw it, was whether to retain the institution and solidify the very existence of the faith or to fight the State and likely be driven out. Amaziah's choice, and the choice of the cult, was to try to

remain alive under conditions prescribed by the State. Amos' confrontation of Amaziah is very painful. Amos, in effect, is correcting Amaziah in the task of his vocation. Amos' pronouncement of doom is a result of the people and the cult rejecting Yahweh. Amaziah's attempt to stop Amos from prophesying is the supreme act of self-judgment. Amos has been called, even as Amaziah. Yet, Amaziah tries to stop Amos from fulfilling his duty.

The implication in this text is that the subtle shift of allegiance from Yahweh-cult to State has gone so far that the intention of the cult is opposite of their behavior. The cult still professes Yahweh. However, the real object of allegiance is the State which grants earthly security. The critical distance which had been an advantage of cult has disappeared. Men live from the strength of the State and not from Yahweh. The cult serves as a comfortable backdrop to their activities. The ambiguity of the goals has become so great that the cult officials themselves are unable to see the self-deceit. The State has successfully claimed the allegiance of the cult and the people by fulfilling their need for security and positive, visible direction.

The conclusion here is simple and obvious. Even the Church is not free from selling its birthright to bargain for temporal security. The Christian in a State may feel that his only chance of survival is to accept a position for the Church which is subordinate to and dependent on the State. The Church of Jesus Christ cannot exist for long on those grounds. A Christian's allegiance is to his Lord.

The heresy of subordination is an ever present danger in a world of professional competition for allegiance. An act of deference is an act of allegiance. The Church, when it refers to the State, gives up a symbolic statement of constitutionality. Amos' rejection of a corrupt cult is evidence that we should have caution in the activity of the Church.

6. Jeremiah's Temple speech completes the shifting of Yahweh to man's condition. Yahweh made attempt after attempt to match Israel's historical context with a meaningful opportunity for relationship with him. The emergence of the State as a "secular" power and the subtle ambiguities in constitutionality moved ever nearer the breaking of any relationship which could be legitimately called allegiance. These texts, in fact, have been more helpful in demonstrating the growing claim of allegiance by a well-intentioned State. The reporter is a Yahwisht. He relates this history with increasingly louder shouts of caution. Allegiance to God is a fragile thing. It is reinforced in the drama of ritual and symbol. It is strengthened by use in daily life. The two arenas are forged to make a meaningful whole. Allegiance is a claim on one's whole life. Here, Jeremiah strikes the final blow.

Israel is do deceived by her own action that she is still able to believe that her earnest prayers on Sabbath are sufficient to counteract the unrighteous living of the week. This corrupt separation of faith and life is condemned by Jeremiah as incongruous with the faith. The faith is something which is the focal point of all of

life. It is not to be a convenient method of expiation from sin. For Israel, the covenant relationship has become a mechanical affair. The nature of allegiance is no longer present in the faith. The zealotness and jealousy of the object of allegiance was no longer present. The acts of allegiance in the cult had lost their force. The acts of allegiance to the State had escalated. The State had caused a hierarchy of loyalties and the cult and faith had been subordinated. Jeremiah spoke against this. His boldness stuns and impresses the people. His life is spared by his boldness and acuteness of speaking Yahweh's prophetic word.

The implication is sure. When a system which was designed to act as a medium for fostering a relationship proves fruitless, it must be discarded. Yahweh's adaptations have been misused. He is left with little to do except to reestablish the covenant again. The past history is to be negated. It will no longer be continuous with what will happen. He will be the same Yahweh. They the same Israel. The language between them will be different. The new covenant will be mediated to their hearts and there will be new symbols to quicken the relationship between them.

The conclusion is terrifying. God is able to give up the institutions of our security in order to establish again the bond which He desires between us. The Church can exist and will exist only as long as it will serve its proper function: the focusing of our whole lives on the claim of Jesus Christ. Only as long as this function is possible will the Church survive. Where the State has subtly subordinated and disempowered it, we are called to make it primary and

powerful again, not by the separation of Church and State into Sunday and Monday but by the "escalation of the faith to the focusing task." Allegiance is a religious category of jealousy. Jeremiah calls his fellow countrymen to forsake the nationalism which had built up in the cult and the State in order to respond again to the claim of Yahweh. Christ calls us to give up our world to accept the contours of His. The challenge is the same.

C. CLOSING REMARKS

This has not been a paper of individual pietism. Neither has it been an apologetic for the separation of Church and State. Rather, it has been a polemic for the positive evaluation of allegiance as a prime relationship for the Christian. This paper has tried to demonstrate the subtle but relentless pressure of allegiance as a category of relationship. Allegiance is a religious, devotional activity. It is exclusivistic. It creates a hierarchy of loyalties. It is reinforced by acts of allegiance.

Two chief claims for our allegiance come from the Church and State. The Church professes Jesus Christ as Lord. This is truly an exclusivistic claim. If we are to heed this call we must submit ourselves and our relationships to careful scrutiny. It would be shamefully shallow to suggest that one simply have faith in Jesus. Pietism is not an answer. In a world where critical decisions are made in the public sphere where the Church is tolerated but never invited to speak, we as Christians have an all the more difficult task.

Many of the goals and practices of the State are worthy. They merit our attention. If we take the claim of our Lord seriously, we must evaluate each position in the light of His claim.

There may, indeed, be places where the will of God and the will of the State go hand in hand. Our study suggests two things. It is not likely that the Church can abandon the world to the State. It is no longer possible for us to ignore the world in which we live. The claim of our faith will not let us. Further, we cannot simply wed the Church to the State. This marriage produces a dangerous relationship wherein prime possibilities remain within the Church. As long as the Church has not lost its self-understanding of its generic constitutionality, it can function as an effective definitive and hermeneutical instrument in the world. When we forget these tasks we begin to lose our way. Yet, as those called by Christ, we must be open to adaptation to the world as history presents it so that we may adapt Christ's Church to the historical context. Only in this way can we hope to present the Church and its message with any credibility. Our task, then, is this. We must be all things to all people and still remain constant to the Lord, who is the same, yesterday, today, and tomorrow.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHAPTER I

- Barbour, R.S. "Loyalty and Law in New Testament Times," Scottish Journal of Theology, XI (1958) 337 - 351.
- Jones, R.T. "Christian Doctrine," Catholic Quarterly, XXXI (1953) 314 - 324.
- Kelley, D.M. "Beyond Separation of Church and State," Journal of Church and State, V, (1963) 181 - 198.
- Matson, T.B. "The Church, the State, and the Christian Ethic," Journal of Church and State, II (1960) 26 - 36.
- Miller, W.L. "Religion and Americanism," Journal of Church and State, V (1963) 15 -26.
- Murray, J.C., S.J. "The Issue of Church and State at Vatican Council II," in C.P O'Donnell. (ed.) The Church in the World. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1968
- Niebuhr, H.R. The Kingdom of God in America. Hamden, Conn. Shoe String Press. 1956.
- Rahner, K. Theology for Renewal. New York: Sheed and Ward. 1964
- Roberts, J.D. "A Theological Conception of the State," Journal of Church and State, IV (1962) 66 - 75.
- Thielicke, H. Theological Ethics. W.H. Lazareth (ed.) 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.
- Wogaman, P. "The changing Role of Government and the Myth of Separation," Journal of Church and State, V (1963) 61 -76.
- Wood, J.E., Jr. "The Problem of Nationalism in Church-State Relationships," Journal of Church and State, X (1968) 249 -264.

CHAPTER II

- Anderson, B.W. Understanding the Old Testament. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1957.
- Bright, J. Jeremiah. (Anchor Bible). Carden City: Doubleday, 1965

- Burney, C.F. The Book of Judges with Introduction and Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings with an Introduction and Appendix. (Library of Biblical Studies) New York: KTAV 1970.
- Caird, G.B. "The First and Second Books of Samuel," in The Interpreter's Bible, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. II.
- Clarke, W.K.L. Concise Bible Commentary. New York: Macmillan, 1953.
- Dentan, R.C. I and II Kings, I and II Chronicles. (Layman's Bible Commentary) Richmond: John Knox Press. 1964.
- Gray, J. I and II Kings. A Commentary. (Old Testament Library) Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1963.
- Habel, N.C. Jeremiah, Lamentations. (Concordian Commentary) St. Louis: Concordia, 1968.
- Hammershaimb, E. The Book of Amos. A Commentary. J. Sturdy (tr.) New York: Schocken, 1970.
- Harper, W.R. Amos and Hosea. (International Critical Commentary) Edinburgh: Clark, 1885.
- Hertzberg, H.W. I and II Samuel. A Commentary. J.S. Bowden (tr.) (Old Testament Library) Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1964.
- Kraft, C.F. "Book of Judges," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. II.
- _____. "Gideon," in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. II.
- Kuist, H.T. The Book of Jeremiah. (Layman's Bible Commentary) Richmond: John Knox Press. 1964
- Laetsch, T. Bible Commentary, Jeremiah. St. Louis: Concordian, 1952
- Leslie, E.A. Jeremiah. Nashville: Abingdon Press. 1954
- Lias, J.J. The Book of Judges. (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges) Cambridge: University Press. 1890.
- Mays, J.L. Amos. A Commentary. (Old Testament Library) Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1969.
- McKane, W. I and II Samuel. Introduction and Commentary. (Torch Bible Commentaries) London: S.C.M. Press, 1963.

Montgomery, J.A. The Books of Kings. H.S. Gehman. (ed.) International Critical Commentary) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1951.

Moore, G.F. Judges. (International Critical Commentary) Edinburgh: Clark. 1895.

Myers, J.M. "The Book of Judges," in The Interpreter's Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953. II.

_____. "Saul, son of Kish," in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. IV.

Noth, M. The History of Israel. P.R. Ackroyd (tr.) rev. ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.

Rad, G. von. Old Testament Theology, D.M.G. Stalker (ed.) 2 vols. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Snaith, N.H. "The First and Second Books of Kings," in The Interpreter's Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953. III.

Ward, J.M. "Naboth," in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. III.

CHAPTER III

Kauffman, D.T. The Dictionary of Religious Terms. Westwood, N.J.: Revell, 1967.

224977
THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.